

American Sentinel, vol. 4

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1889	5
January 1889	5
"Principles Not Parties" American Sentinel 4, 1.	5
"The Amended Sunday Bill" American Sentinel 4, 1.	9
THE BILL AS IT IS	10
THE BILL WITH CHANGES DESIRED BY THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION	12
January 30, 1889	18
"The Parent and the State" American Sentinel 4, 2.	18
"Make a Note of This" American Sentinel 4, 2.	21
"A Sample of Moral Obtuseness" American Sentinel 4, 2.	23
February 6, 1889	26
"The Latest Sunday-law Petition" American Sentinel 4, 3.	26
"Why the California Sunday Law Was Repealed" American Sentinel 4, 3.	30
February 13, 1889	33
"Sunday Law Meeting in Oakland" American Sentinel 4, 4.	33
"A Sign of the Times" American Sentinel 4, 4.	36
"Showing Its Parentage" American Sentinel 4, 4.	38
"Who Are Working for the Sunday Law?" American Sentinel 4, 4.	40
February 20, 1889	42
"A Tangible Object" American Sentinel 4, 5.	42
"Provisions of the Sunday Rest Bill" American Sentinel 4, 5.	47
February 27, 1889	52
"Subjection to the Powers That Be" American Sentinel 4, 6.	52
"Proposed Persecution in Tennessee" American Sentinel 4, 6.	56
March 6, 1889	59
"The Blair Education Amendment Bill" American Sentinel 4, 7.	59
ARTICLE—	61
March 13, 1889	65
"Only the Name, Not the Power" American Sentinel 4, 8.	65
March 20, 1889	67
"The Blair Educational Amendment Bill. (Concluded.)" American Sentinel 4, 9.	67
"The State to Enforce Church Discipline" American Sentinel 4, 9.	69
March 27, 1889	73
"Civil Sunday and Civil Lent" American Sentinel 4, 10.	73
April 3, 1889	77
"Questions of the Blair Bills" American Sentinel 4, 11.	77
April 10, 1889	82
"Sunday Laws and Temperance" American Sentinel 4, 12.	82
April 17, 1889	85
"Is This 'the Breath of the Puritan?'" American Sentinel 4, 13.	85
"Whose Image and Superscription Is This?" American Sentinel 4, 13.	90
CONTENTS	92
May 1, 1889	97
"Sunday Law and the Law of Nature" American Sentinel 4, 15.	97

May 15, 1889	103
"Fifty Designated" American Sentinel 4, 16.	103
May 22, 1889	106
"Protection to Religious Worship, and the Bible in the Schools" American Sentinel 4, 17.	
"The Blair Bill" American Sentinel 4, 17.	111106
May 29, 1889	117
"Dr. Crafts at Pittsburg" American Sentinel 4, 18.	117
"Sunday Laws Antichristian" American Sentinel 4, 18.	123
June 5, 1889	128
"The Secular Theory of Education" American Sentinel 4, 19.	128
"A True National Reform Government" American Sentinel 4, 19.	132
"That Petition Again" American Sentinel 4, 19.	140
"Exemption Clauses in Sunday Laws" American Sentinel 4, 19.	142
June 12, 1889	145
"A Misleading Petition—Which One Is It?" American Sentinel 4, 20.	145
"Mr. Crafts against Facts" American Sentinel 4, 20.	150
June 19, 1889	157
"Christopher Ephraim's Tottering Morality" American Sentinel 4, 21.	157
June 26, 1889	163
"Who Are the Friends of the Bible?" American Sentinel 4, 22.	163
July 3, 1889	167
"Editor Shephard and the Baptist Clergymen" American Sentinel 4, 23.	167
July 17, 1889	171
"Mr. Crafts and the Petitioners Again" American Sentinel 4, 25.	171
July 31, 1889	180
"To Crush The Liquor Traffic?" American Sentinel 4, 27.	180
August 7, 1889	182
"Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law" American Sentinel 4, 28.	182
August 14, 1889	187
"An Unchristian Union" American Sentinel 4, 29.	187
September 11, 1889	195
"Sunday Prohibition" American Sentinel 4, 31.	195
September 18, 1889	197
"Our Position" American Sentinel 4, 34.	197
"The State to Let Religion Alone" American Sentinel 4, 34.	199
"Does it Pay?" American Sentinel 4, 34.	200
October 10, 1889	204
"National Reform Bigotry" American Sentinel 4, 36.	204
October 16, 1889	206
"Sunday in California and New York" American Sentinel 4, 37.	206
"Mr. Small on Church and State" American Sentinel 4, 38.	207
"Sunday Closing Not a Temperance Measure" American Sentinel 4, 38.	211
"The Petition and the Inquisition" American Sentinel 4, 38.	213
October 30, 1889	218
"The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights" American Sentinel 4, 40.	218
"How is This?" American Sentinel 4, 40.	223
November 6, 1889	226
"Is the Constitution Infidel?" American Sentinel 4, 41.	226

"The Christian Statesman in Favor of Church and State Union" American Sentinel 4, 41.	231
November 13, 1889	228
"Their Object" American Sentinel 4, 41.	231
November 20, 1889	233
"The Principles of Constitutional Recognition of God" American Sentinel 4, 42.	233
"Why They Are Anxious" American Sentinel 4, 42.	238
November 27, 1889	240
"National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution" American Sentinel 4, 44.	240
"They Are One" American Sentinel 4, 44.	246
December 4, 1889	249
"Legitimate Recreation" American Sentinel 4, 45.	249
December 25, 1889	251
"Civil Government and the Decalogue" American Sentinel 4, 48.	251
"Why We Oppose Religious Legislation" American Sentinel 4, 48.	254

# 1889

## January 1889

**“Principles Not Parties” American Sentinel 4, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

From a gentleman in the State of New York, a minister of the gospel, we have received a letter inquiring into the political affiliations of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. The letter is too long to be published entire, but we will give enough of it so that the reader may have a good idea of its contents. After stating that in his section the extra SENTINEL was circulated by Republicans, as campaign literature against the Prohibition party, he says:—*AMS January 1889, page 2.1*

“With the SENTINEL, I am uncompromisingly opposed to anything tending toward union of Church and State either in name or in fact. My pen and voice have been and still will be against it. I have recently lectured against the encroachments of Rome, and opposed also the legislation that fined and imprisoned your people for quietly and lawfully working on Sunday.*AMS January 1889, page 2.2*

“But your articles in the SENTINEL, as far as I have been able to see, would lead one to infer that you are not alarmed in regard to Republicans, and their attitude on the Sunday question, but are fully awake to the tendency of Prohibitionists to link in the question with that of temperance....*AMS January 1889, page 2.3*

“Dr. Carroll, editor of the N. Y. *Independent*, in a speech in favor of his party (anti-saloon Republican) declared that all legislation for the better observance of Sunday had come from the Republican party; and intimated that such would be the case in the future. In your article against such legislation, you say much about Senator Blair’s bill, styling him a Prohibitionist, etc.*AMS January 1889, page 2.4*

“Senator Blair is a staunch Republican, sent to the Senate by Republicans. His hope of passing his bills, and securing Sunday legislation, is in the attitude of a Republican Congress. From a

Republican Congress and a Republican President, he hopes to secure what you and I denounce as a menace to religious liberty. He has no hopes of doing this inside of any other party, for he does not believe a third party can obtain control of the Government. Republicans in Congress are working together to secure legislation in the interests of Rome. Protestant Republicans are the men who to-day are the greatest plotters against religious freedom. Why, then, are you so much against Prohibitionists, but fail to say much, if anything, against the Republican party, to which Carroll, Blair, and company look for future Sunday legislation?"*AMS January 1889, page 2.5*

We have quoted the principal part of the letter. From a perusal of the whole, it seems to us that our brother is moved quite as much by hatred of the Republican party as by desire to see justice done to the Prohibition party. As for the SENTINEL, we can say with truth that it is strictly non-partisan. It deals only with principles, and with facts as they illustrate or stand in opposition to those principles. And here we will say that the greatest fault that we have seen in the Prohibition party is the intense, bitter, and almost unreasoning partisan spirit manifested by its leaders. In the late campaign we listened to several speeches by prominent Prohibitionists, and their whole animus seemed to be hatred of the two old parties. The Prohibition journals were the same. Their whole campaign stock seemed to be vituperation and abuse of Republicans and Democrats. We are no apologist for either of the old parties, and are not claiming that much that was said against them was not true; but such political methods seem to use decidedly out of place in a party which professes to be the party of moral ideas.*AMS January 1889, page 2.6*

Our friend charges all the alliance with Romanism upon the Republican party. This seems to us a little strange, since the Democratic party has been proverbial for years as the party that was dominated by the Catholics. President Cleveland's obsequious attention to Cardinal Gibbons is well known to all our readers; and who has forgotten the insult which his administration gave to the whole American nation, when it sent a Government vessel to meet the emissaries of the Pope, when they came on a church mission, and how the Papal flag was hoisted above the stars and

stripes?*AMS January 1889, page 3.1*

The fact of the matter is that both the old parties are like the Prohibition party, in that they favor whatever will bring them the most votes at any particular time. No man is warranted in saying that any particular party will be the party that will offer the greatest menace to religious liberty. It is highly probable that some entirely new party will be instrumental in consummating that work. We have nothing to do with parties as such. The SENTINEL has no fight against any political party. But when it sees movements on foot that tend most directly to overthrow religious liberty, it will vigorously oppose them, no matter by whom they are championed. To show that this is true, we need only say that six years ago, when the matter of a Sunday law was the only issue between the two great parties in California, we circulated hundreds of thousands of papers opposing the stand taken by the Republican party, and it was said that the work done by the publishers of the SENTINEL contributed in no small degree to the defeat of that party. When the party dropped that issue, there was no longer any necessity for opposing its work. It is not true that the Blair Bill is a Republican measure, for we know of a surety that the most vigorous opposition that it will meet in the House will be from Republicans. Moreover, we have seen Mr. Harrison's statement, signed with his own hand, to the effect that he does not favor such legislation as is proposed by Senator Blair.*AMS January 1889, page 3.2*

We well know that Senator Blair is a Republican, but we have no evidence that his measure is a Republican measure. The readers of the SENTINEL can testify that Senator Blair's Republicanism has not prevented us from opposing his work; and we think that our action in the past is ample proof that we should pursue a like course in regard to the Republican party as a whole, if it should endorse Senator Blair's bills.*AMS January 1889, page 3.3*

And now for a few facts to show that the Prohibition party is pre-eminently the party that is devoted to religious legislation.*AMS January 1889, page 3.4*

1. Chairman Dickie said in answer to a question, that the disfranchisement of woman is a greater curse than all the saloons

in the country. And Sam Small, secretary of the National Prohibition Convention, said: “One reason why I favor woman suffrage is because we would have more Christian voters if the women were allowed to vote.” Thus it appears from the highest authority that the Prohibition party is not primarily a temperance party, but is a woman suffrage party, and *that* for the purpose of advancing its religio-political designs.*AMS January 1889, page 3.5*

2. In a speech in Kansas City, Sam Small, who is one of the Prohibition party leaders, said:—*AMS January 1889, page 3.6*

“I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws.”*AMS January 1889, page 3.7*

Talk about the encroachments of Rome! How much better would this be? Not a bit better, but rather worse, because it would include the Catholic Church, and so to its despotism would be added that of all the other churches. For ourselves we can say that we shall never cease to antagonize any effort tending in that direction, no matter how highly “moral” the party making them may profess to be.*AMS January 1889, page 3.8*

3. Speaking about the morality of the Prohibition party reminds us of what the *Lever* said some time ago:—*AMS January 1889, page 3.9*

“At this point the Prohibition party stands out in bold contrast with the old parties. It recognizes the authority of God in human government, and proposes that all legislation shall be in harmony with Christian morality.”*AMS January 1889, page 3.10*

Here we see that the religious character of the Prohibition party is set forth as its great point of superiority over the old parties.*AMS January 1889, page 3.11*

4. In the *Christian Statesman* of November 22, 1888, there appeared an editorial entitled, “Have We a Christian Party?” in which, after saying that “no one will claim that either one of the dominant parties in American politics is a Christian party,” and that



the character of the Prohibition party in this respect has not yet been definitely settled, it says of it:—*AMS January 1889, page 3.12*

“We acknowledge with cheerful thankfulness the religious utterances which from time to time have appeared in its platforms. It has definitely acknowledged almighty God as the source of all power in civil Government. It has declared for the maintenance of the Christian Sabbath. Some of its State platforms have avowed the purpose of the party to be to apply the principles of the Christian religion to our whole political life, and several county platforms have made express acknowledgment of Jesus Christ as the ruler of nations. These are new utterances in American politics. They have no precedent and no parallel in the history of parties among us. They have awakened the brightest hopes among those who feel that the question of all questions, of which the temperance question itself, in its deepest aspects, is only a part, is whether we shall maintain or shall forego our national Christianity.”*AMS January 1889, page 3.13*

This shows that the National Reform Association, of which the *Statesman* is the chief organ, looks with great expectation to the rising Prohibition party to further its aims. That its expectations are based on reason appears not only from the above, but from many other things. In last month’s *SENTINEL*, page 94, there appeared a short article showing from the statement of an intelligent Prohibition worker that the Prohibition party is the Church and State party.*AMS January 1889, page 3.14*

These are points enough to show that the *SENTINEL* could not be true to itself if it did not antagonize, not temperance, nor Constitutional Prohibition, but that which constitutes the chief work of the nominally prohibition party. When the Republican party, or any other party, makes religion an issue, we shall oppose its work just as vigorously. We should oppose them as vigorously even if they were advocated by the church of which we are members.*AMS January 1889, page 3.15*

E. J. W.*AMS January 1889, page 3.16*

**“The Amended Sunday Bill” American Sentinel 4, 1.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have already, in two separate issues of the SENTINEL, printed and commented upon the Blair Sunday Rest Bill; but certain changes have been made in it of late, and in order that our readers may keep informed as to the spirit of Sunday legislation, we once more print the bill, together with the amended form. First, we print the bill as it is, and second, the bill with the changes desired by the “American Sabbath Union,” followed by the reasons for the changes, and our comments thereon. The “Special Committee” spoken of in the title of the report consisted of Col. Elliot F. Shepard, Bishop Hurst, Dr. Sunderland, Dr. Ruskin, Dr. Knowles, Dr. Elliott, and others, with Mrs. J. Ellen Foster as legal adviser. The report is as follows:—*AMS January 1889, page 6.1*

## REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CHANGES DESIRED THE SUNDAY REST BILL.

### THE BILL AS IT IS

In the Senate of the United States, May 21, 1888, Mr. Blair introduced the following bill, which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:—*AMS January 1889, page 6.2*

50th Congress, 1st Session, S. 2983.*AMS January 1889, page 6.3*

A Bill to Secure to the People the Enjoyment of the First Day of the Week Commonly known as the Lord’s Day, as a Day of Rest, and to Promote its Observance as a Day of Religious Worship*AMS January 1889, page 6.4*

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, or amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week commonly known*

as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.*AMS January 1889, page 6.5*

SECTION 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week: Provided, That whenever any letter shall relate to work of necessity or mercy, or shall concern the health, life, or decease of any person, and the fact shall be plainly stated upon the face of the envelope containing the same, the Postmaster-General shall provide for the transportation of such letter or letters in packages separate from other mail matter, and shall make regulations for the delivery thereof, the same having been received at its place of destination before the said first day of the week, during such limited portion of the day as shall best suit the public convenience and least interfere with the due observance of the day as one of worship and rest: And provided further, That when there shall have been an interruption in the due and regular transmission of the mails it shall be lawful to so far examine the same when delivered as to ascertain if there be such matter therein for lawful delivery on the first day of the week.*AMS January 1889, page 6.6*

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, the same not being work of necessity, mercy, nor humanity, by the transportation of persons or property by land or water in such way as to interfere with or disturb the people in the enjoyment of the first day of the week, or any portion thereof, as a day of rest from labor, the same not being labor of necessity, mercy, or humanity, or its observance as a day of religious worship, is, hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall willfully violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid for the same.*AMS January 1889, page 6.7*

SEC. 4. That all military and naval drills, musters, and parades, not in time of active service or immediate preparation therefor, of soldiers, sailors, marines, or cadets of the United States, on the first day of the week, except assemblies for the due and orderly observance of religious worship, are hereby prohibited, nor shall any unnecessary labor be performed or permitted in the military or naval service of the United States on the Lord's day.*AMS January 1889, page 6.8*

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful to pay or to receive payment or wages in any manner for service rendered, or for labor performed, or for the transportation of persons or of property in violation of the provisions of this act, nor shall any action lie for the recovery thereof, and when so paid, whether in advance or otherwise, the same may be recovered back by whoever shall first sue for the same.*AMS January 1889, page 6.9*

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and rendered on the first day of the week in consequence of accident, disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal-routes and routes of travel and transportation, the preservation of perishable and exposed property, and the regular and necessary transportation and delivery of articles of food in condition for healthy use, and such transportation for short distances from one State, district, or Territory into another State, district, or Territory as by local laws shall be declared to be necessary for the public good, shall not be deemed violations of this act, but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath day.*AMS January 1889, page 6.10*

**THE BILL WITH CHANGES DESIRED BY THE AMERICAN SABBATH UNION**

(Changes indicated by full-face letters and stars.) Unanimously adopted December 12, 1888.*AMS January 1889, page 6.11*

A Bill to Secure to the People the enjoyment of the *Lord's Day*, commonly known as *Sunday*, as a Day of Rest, and to *Protect* its Observance as a Day of Religions Worship*AMS January 1889,*

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Sunday, no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business \* \* \* works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, show, exhibition, or amusement \* \* \* open to the public, or of a public character, in any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section.*AMS January 1889, page 6.13

SEC. 2. That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in time of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of Sunday.AMS January 1889, page 6.14

SEC. 3. That the prosecution of commerce between the States and with the Indian tribes, \* \* \* by the transportation of persons or property by land or water \* \* \* on the first day of the week \* \* \* is hereby prohibited, and any person or corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall \* violate this section shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars, and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable, or be paid for the same.AMS January 1889, page 6.15

SEC. 6. That labor or service performed and ordered on *Sunday* in consequence of accident or disaster, or unavoidable delays in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of travel and transportation, the \* \* \* transportation and delivery of *milk* before 5 A.M. \* \* \* and after 10 P.M. but the same shall be construed, so far as possible, to secure to the whole people rest from toil during *Sunday*, their mental and moral culture, and the *protection of the* religious observance of the \* day.AMS January 1889, page 6.16

The reasons for the changes asked are, in part, as follows:—*AMS January 1889, page 6.17*

For religious purposes we prefer the name Lord's day or Christian Sabbath, but as Sunday is already used in National laws, we think it better to use that uniformly in this bill, with the one exception of the double name in the title.*AMS January 1889, page 6.18*

The word "promote" in the title goes beyond what many, even your Christian citizens, believe to be the proper function of Government with reference to "religious worship," while the word "protect" (we also last line) expresses a duty which Government owes to all legitimate institutions of the people.*AMS January 1889, page 6.19*

Experience in the courts has shown that the words "show, exhibition," should be added to the list of prohibited Sunday amusements, and the words "in public," in place of "to the disturbance of others," as the latter clause has been construed as requiring that persons living in the neighborhood of a Sunday game or show must testify that they have been disturbed, in order to a conviction, which cannot be done in some cases without personal peril.*AMS January 1889, page 6.20*

In Section 2, we believe that the exceptions for letters relating to sickness, etc., are unnecessary in this age of the telegraph; and that they would be used by unscrupulous men in business correspondence, and that this would destroy most of the benefits of the law in its bearing on Sunday mails.*AMS January 1889, page 6.21*

In Section 3, we believe the exceptions made would greatly interfere with the law. The exception for work of mercy and necessity is made, once for all, in the first section. The reference to "the disturbance of others" is objectionable for reasons already given, and the word "willfully" is an old offender in Sabbath legislation, and requires evidence very hard to get in regard to one's motive and knowledge of the law. In other laws it is assumed that one knows the law, and the law-making power should see that the laws are well published, and leave no room for one to escape by agnosticism.*AMS January 1889, page 6.22*

In Section 5 (as in section 1 also), we would omit “Lord’s day,” and in Section 6, “Sabbath,” in order to preserve uniformity in using the less religious term, Sunday.*AMS January 1889, page 6.23*

In Section 6, we think refrigerator cars make Sunday work in transportation of perishable food, except milk, unnecessary, and the new stock cars, with provision for food and water, do the same for stock trains. So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by small exceptions and large penalties.*AMS January 1889, page 6.24*

With a little care in comparison, the reader can readily see what changes have been made in the bill. We have omitted sections 4 and 5 from the revised bill, because they are the same as the corresponding sections in the original bill, with the single exception of “Sunday” being substituted for “Lord’s day,” in last line of section 4. We hope that everyone will study both bills thoroughly, together with the committee’s reasons for the changes. Anyone can see that the changes are in the line of greater stringency. We note only the most prominent points.*AMS January 1889, page 6.25*

1. The change from “Lord’s day” to Sunday, although a proper one, is in reality no change at all, since the term “Lord’s day” is still used at the beginning, and it is expressly stated that Sunday is used a matter of custom. It is understood that it is as a *religious* day, indicated by the term “Lord’s day” that they want the observance of the first day of the week enforced; but if the term “Sunday” is quite generally used, it will no doubt “take” better.*AMS January 1889, page 6.26*

2. In asking for the “*protection* of the religious observance of the day,” instead of the *promotion* of its observance as a day of religious worship, the committee threw a sop to those who are “on the fence” in regard to religious legislation. As it stands, it amounts to nothing; for there is not a State or Territory in the Union where any religious service held on Sunday would not be protected.*AMS January 1889, page 7.1*

3. The most important change of all, however, is the substitution of the words “in public” instead of “to the disturbance of others,” in section 1. This will certainly make the law more effective. It is obvious that if a man were to engage in work a mile from a dwelling-house, it would be quite a task for the owner of the house to convince even an ordinary jury that such labor disturbed him; but by the terms of the amended bill, the man may be convicted if he is working in a public place, provided anybody can get near enough to him to see him.*AMS January 1889, page 7.2*

4. Notice the radical change made in section 2. As amended, it is most sweeping, allowing of no exception. The mail is not to be carried at all on Sunday, even in case of sickness and death, lest some “unscrupulous” person should mention business on that day. If the mail is not carried, of course that will make him a good man! It is no concern of ours how they propose to carry out this law, but we can’t help wondering what they will do when Sunday comes, and a train carrying the mail is on the way, say from Chicago to New Orleans. The train is owned by a corporation, and is not in a part of the country “subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States,” and therefore could not be forced to lie over. The only way out of the difficulty, under the provision of this bill, would be to dump all the mail out at the nearest station, and let it lie there till Sunday was past.*AMS January 1889, page 7.3*

This, however, would not be done. What would be done would be the passing of laws by the several States, forbidding all labor within their jurisdiction, and it is this for which these zealous people are scheming. This United States law is designed as a precedent, and as a lever with which to secure the religious observance of Sunday by all the people in the United States, whether they are religious or not.*AMS January 1889, page 7.4*

5. We wish to call special attention, also, to the last sentence of the “reason for the changes asked.” It says: “So many of the State Sunday laws have proved almost useless in protecting the rights of the people to Sunday rest, and undisturbed worship, by the smallness of their penalties and the largeness of their exceptions, that we covet from Congress a law that shall make itself effective by *small exceptions and large penalties.*” There the real spirit of the



dragon exhibits itself. In that simple statement is compressed a world of bigotry and animosity. History has abundantly shown that the bitterness and hate which bigoted men feel toward those who differ with them in religious opinion, are the worst of all. It is very natural for a bigoted man to imagine that when *his* views are not respected it is a direct insult to the Lord, and that he is the divinely appointed agent to punish all such offenses. The spirit of the statement which we have just quoted is this: "We want things fixed so that those who do not believe as we do can be fully within our power, so that we can wreak on them all the hatred which we feel for them."*AMS January 1889, page 7.5*

We speak strongly, because the case demands it. We do not speak thus in order to arouse a feeling against those who are engineering this thing, but that all who read it may be led to examine the matter for themselves more closely, that they may see the wickedness of the whole business, and may protest. Petitions against tampering with the Constitution, and dabbling in religious legislation, have been sent far and wide, and we believe that it will be seen that there are many thousands of people in the United States who are not willing to forge chains with which to bind themselves, nor to lend themselves to the work of binding others. No scheme more iniquitous, nor more opposed to the spirit of the gospel of Christ, was ever set on foot in this country.*AMS January 1889, page 7.6*

E. J. W.

## January 30, 1889

**“The Parent and the State” American Sentinel 4, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is no paper that comes we prize more highly than we do *America*, because of its general straightforward, outspoken, manly defense of true American principles. It is therefore with the greater regret that we see it going so wide of the mark as it does in the following paragraph:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 9.1*

“Fifty years ago instruction in primary principles of the Christian religion might have been left to private schools, churches, and the family; but it was not. To-day he must be an optimistic dreamer who expects Christian morality to be inculcated among our youth through any such adventitious means. Unless the children of the republic receive some religious training in the public schools, they will go absolutely without it.”*AMS January 30, 1889, page 9.2*

The self-contradictory statements in this must be obvious to all. If there is so little Christian morality in this country that, unless it is taught in the public schools, the children will go “absolutely without it,” where are they going to find people who can teach it in the public schools? This one thing stamps the article as the hasty utterance of one who made up his mind from feeling rather than reason.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 9.3*

It is not true that churches and the family are “adventitious means” for inculcating Christian morality. As a matter of fact, the Bible knows of no other means. Hear the divine rule for the instruction in the moral law:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 9.4*

“Thou, shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might. And these words, which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart; and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up.” *Deuteronomy 6:5-7. AMS January 30, 1889, page 9.5*

This is family instruction in morals, the only means of instruction that God ever ordained. The highest recommendation that God could give to Abraham was this: "I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him, and they shall keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." *Genesis 18:19.AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.1*

The parent is to the child in the place of God, to give it instruction in the way it should go. In the Bible we find instruction to parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; to teach the commandments to their sons and their sons sons; to correct their children betimes, etc.; but we find not the slightest hint that the State should do this if the parent fails to do his duty. The same word that tells parents to teach the law to their children, also enjoins parents to have the law of God in their hearts. Now the same logic which would take the child out of the parent's hands, and turn him over to the State for instruction in morals, provided the parent is remiss in his duty, would also provide that the State should attempt to make the parent himself moral, if he has neglected the word of God. When the State begins to teach morals, it cannot logically stop short of assuming the whole business, and taking the place of the churches as the agent for spreading the gospel.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.2*

We read that a child left to himself will bring his mother to shame; but we have no intimation that the State is to take such a child, and train him so that he will be an honor to his parents. When the position is taken that the State must assume the responsibility of caring for children, and seeing that they have good morals, it is but a step to the old heathen custom which was advocated by Plato, and which was actually in use among the Spartans, and some other Greeks, that the State should control the matter of who shall beget children. Surely if the State has the burden of training children in morals, so as to make them the best citizens, it should have a chance to see that its burden is as light as possible. And since, from the very nature of the case, it is impossible for the State to control absolutely the matter of marriages and births, so as to secure only the best specimens of childhood, it is but another step to the heathen custom of destroying those infants which the officers of the State did not deem suitable to bring up.*AMS January 30, 1889,*

*page 10.3*

We don't say that this Government will ever do this thing, for we don't think that it will last long enough to come to that; but it is the logical result of the parental theory of Government; and if the United States Government should exist for a hundred years after the adoption of National Reform ideas, that is just what it would come to.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.4*

In the Cincinnati Convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D Mayo said:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.5*

"But why not divide this work, and leave the moral and religious part of the education of the citizen to the parent and priest? Because you cannot hold the parent or the priest to any public responsibility to educate the child into that practical form of religion and morality essential to good citizenship in a republican State."*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.6*

There you have it. National Reform doctrine is, just as *America* proposes, that the State shall take the child out of the parent's hands entirely. If you are in favor with the State, you may be permitted to retain your child; but if your morals are not such as the State approves, if your form of religion is different from that which the State has adopted, no matter how moral you may be, then your child must be taken from you and brought up in such a way that it may be an honor to the church and the State. This has the Roman Catholic Church ever assumed the right to do, and thus National Reformers stamp their movement as the legitimate child of the Papacy. And since the Papacy is but paganism under another form, what is there to prevent them, if time should continue, from degenerating into the heathen custom before referred to?*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.7*

Our position is this, and we challenge anybody to show that it is not correct: Every child ought to have good moral instruction, and should be trained to fear the Lord. The parent or guardian is the only one who has the duty of giving to the child this instruction and training. If the parent, either from indifference or incompetency, fails to do his duty in this respect, it is the child's loss, but there is no power on earth that has a right to take the child out of the parent's

hand on this account. If the child is lost, the parent alone is responsible to God for bringing into the world a child and then neglecting its most important interest. And so we say that if the parent does not give the child moral instruction, and does not put the child in the way of receiving such instruction from the church, then the child must go absolutely without it, at least until it is old enough to act for itself. This we say without any reserve. It would be true even if the State should assume the obligations of a parent; for, since the State can do properly only that which it is ordained to do, it follows that the children whom it might adopt would, in reality, be as destitute of moral instruction as though their unbelieving parents had been allowed to retain full control of them.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 10.8*

E. J. W.

**“Make a Note of This” American Sentinel 4, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the session of the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor, held in Philadelphia, November 16, Rev. W. F. Crafts delivered a speech on “Sunday Work from an Humanitarian Standpoint,” which the Journal of United Labor calls a “masterly address.” It was, of course, an appeal to the Knights of Labor to lend their influence to the securing of a National Sunday law. At its close opportunity was given for questions, when the following was asked among others:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.1*

“Could not this weekly rest-day be secured without reference to religion, by having the workmen of an establishment scheduled in regular order for one day of rest per week, whichever was most convenient, not all resting on any one day?”*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.2*

This was a fair question, and the plan suggested affords a perfect solution of the question, if the claim so often made be true, that the sole object for a Sunday law is the securing to working men of the right to rest on one day in seven, in accordance with the requirements of nature. But notice Mr. Crafts’s answer:—*AMS*

*January 30, 1889, page 13.3*

“A weekly day of rest has never been se-cured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out.”*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.4*

Ah, just so! Thus, according to Mr. Crafts, who must be the best authority, for he is the prime mover in the matter, what they are after is a law compelling people to observe the first day of the week religiously. This is in harmony with the following utterances before the National Sunday Association assembled in Washington. Referring to the petitioners for a Sunday law, Mrs. Bateham said:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.5*

“They are praying that the Government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week.”*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.6*

Of course, if there can be no rest without religion, then it follows that they want to enforce the religious observance of Sunday; and if that would not be enforcing religion, and trying to compel people to be religious, we should like to know what would be. The show still further that this is the case, we quote the following statement, which we have seen in several reports, and which seems to be credited to Mr. Crafts:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.7*

“The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship. No amusement or recreation should be indulged in, no mail handled or railroads run except under pressing necessity, with a fine of from \$10 to \$1,000 as the penalty for non-observance of the law.”*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.8*

There you have it. The paper from which these last two quotations are made is the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21. Its editor was present at the Convention, and took an active part in the proceedings. Yet, in spite of all these statements, Mr. Crafts, in the same speech to which we before referred, said that “Sunday laws do not in any way interfere with true liberty, for they do not require, any man to be religious”!*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.9*

Think of it! A law is required that will compel all people to rest on Sunday. It is expressly claimed that there can be no such law except on the basis of religious obligation, and that if the religion be taken out, the rest is taken out; and yet he says that such a law would interfere with no man's liberty, because it is not designed to make men religious. With the last we perfectly agree. Such a law is not designed to make men religious, but only hypocritical. But we cannot agree with the first part, for there are some people whose liberty would be greatly interfered with, by an attempt to make them play the hypocrite. We claim the liberty to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, and not according to somebody else's opinions or practices. E. J. W.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 13.10*

**"A Sample of Moral Obtuseness" American Sentinel 4, 2.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of September 27, 1888, had, as usual, a report from Secretary Foster. In it he told about a sermon which he preached in Cincinnati on "Sunday Observance," and after detailing the compliments which he received for it, he continued thus:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.1*

"There is a general feeling of anxiety among the people for our sabbath. They feel that something should be done, but there is a nightmare inability to do anything. A good brother said to me: 'The Sunday paper comes to my house regularly. We began taking it during the war. We wanted the latest news from the battle-fields, and it has been coming ever since. I know it is wrong. There should not be any Sunday paper. It is an injury to society; but when others take it, we might as well have it.'" *AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.2*

And so, of course, he is in favor of a law that will stop Sunday papers and all other work. On the statements in the paragraph just quoted, we have just the following points which we wish to emphasize:—*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.3*

1. The people do well to be anxious about their sabbath, when they themselves have not interest enough in it to keep it without being

forced to do so.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.4*

2. If Sunday is “our sabbath,” as they call it, what right have they to compel people who have no interest in it to adopt it as theirs? As well might the shop-keeper compel people to buy his goods as to compel them to accept his sabbath.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.5*

3. This man is not alone in calling Sunday “our sabbath.” National Reformers, and all Sunday-law advocates, speak of “our sabbath,” “our American sabbath,” etc. This they want enforced upon the people by law. At the same time they insist that there can be no real Sunday rest secured to the people, except on the basis of religious obligation. Then it is a point that admits of no debate, that they are seeking to enforce religion on the people, and that the religion which they wish to enforce is *their* religion. In other words, they want to put themselves in place of God, and have the people’s sciences regulated by *their* will.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.6*

4. When a man has not enough moral stamina to do a thing which he believes in his heart he ought to do, without being forced to do it by civil law, how much better will the law make him? Not a particle. He will be in just the condition of the thief who has been shut up in prison, and who is honest because there is nothing for him to steal. It is such service as this that National Reformers think will bring in the millennium!*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.7*

5. If they wish to know the cause of this laxness in Sunday observance, on the part of those who profess to keep it, and who even clamor for laws enforcing its observance, we can give it. It is because they do not really believe that Sunday has any claim upon them. They know full well that it has no divine sanction, and they cannot keep themselves up to the point of doing that which in their inmost heart they know is not required of them by divine law. Their appeal for a civil law shows their unbelief in there being any divine law upholding it.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.8*

We believe that these points are clear to the comprehension of every reader, and that they cannot be gainsaid.*AMS January 30, 1889, page 14.9*



E. J. W.

## February 6, 1889

**“The Latest Sunday-law Petition” American Sentinel 4, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

There is now being circulated quite extensively a petition to the California Legislature, asking that body to enact a Sunday law. From some things, which it is not necessary to name here, we feel as though it is not being circulated as extensively as it might be, and we believe that there is an effort on the part of those who are behind it, to keep its contents a secret from all except those whom they are quite sure will favor it. Be that as it may, we propose to give the matter a little more publicity than it has yet had, and to that end shall give the substance of what is on the petition, with some comments.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 17.1*

The fact that the petition is the work of the California Woman's Christian Temperance Union, is no secret. It is so stated in bold letters on the face of it. Underneath this statement are the words, "Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work." *Exodus 20:8, 9*. And by the side of this is the following text of Scripture: Hallow my Sabbaths; and they shall be a sign between me and you, that ye may know that I am the Lord your God." *Ezekiel 20:20*. What logical connection these texts can have with a petition for a Sunday law, is more than we can imagine. They both refer to the seventh day of the week, and not to the first, and this fact is well known by every member of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Even if they could by any possibility apply to Sunday, they would be out of place on a petition a "civil Sabbath," as it is called, if that is what they are after; and this also they very well know. We are therefore forced to the conclusion that what they want is a law that will enable them to have Sunday treated as though it were the Sabbath which God gave to his people, and commands men to observe. In short, they want the State to enforce an act of religion on purely religious grounds.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 17.2*

Next follows the petition itself, which reads as follows:—*AMS February 6, 1889, page 17.3*

*“To the Honorable, the Senate and Assembly of the State of California:—AMS February 6, 1889, page 17.4*

“Greeting: We, the undersigned, residents of—, in the county of—, State of California, in view of the dissipation and demoralizing influences arising from the desecration of Sunday in the State, earnestly and respectfully petition your honorable body for the enactment of a Sunday law that shall give laboring men a day of rest; prohibit the carrying on of all unnecessary business; prohibit barbarous, unseemly, and noisy amusements, such as theaters, processions, concerts, games; and also the opening upon Sunday of all places where intoxicating beverages are sold; also providing, by proper legislation, for the enforcement thereof.”*AMS February 6, 1889, page 17.5*

Following this is the blank space for signatures. There are a few points in this to which we wish to call the attention of the people of California, and especially of the honorable members of the Legislature. The first is the statement concerning the “desecration of Sunday.” The word “desecration” is the exact opposite of “consecration.” Nothing can be *desecrated* unless it has first been *consecrated*. But you will search in vain for any record of the consecration of Sunday. In fact, but few people presume to argue for any express divine sanction for Sunday observance. Therefore “desecration” is not a proper word to apply to Sunday labor or amusement.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.1*

But pass by the question of Sunday sacredness. One thing is clearly shown by its use in this petition, and that is, that the petitioners propose to get such a law as will, enable them to prohibit anything that would be a desecration of the day if it were sacred. They, propose to have a law that will enable them to make people *act* as though they regarded Sunday as a holy day, whether they really think so or not. They want the State to make people who are not religious act as though they were, and to force *their* forms of religion on those who do not believe them.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.2*

The required law must “prohibit the carrying on of all unnecessary business.” Who is to decide what business is necessary, and what

is not? The man who carries on the business is the best judge of whether or not it is necessary, but it is obvious that the law would be a dead letter if he were allowed that privilege. "Unnecessary business" indefinite. Suppose a man is a mechanic. He has a job on hand which he cannot finish according to contract unless he works on Sunday. He may think that such work is necessary but our observation of the administration of Sunday laws convinces us that it would not be so regarded by those in power.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.3*

We wish especial notice to be taken of the fact that such a law as is petitioned for would naturally lead to religious persecution. We shall prove this on two counts.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.4*

First, take the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week. If he is a laboring man, he is obliged to work six in order to support his family. His conscience will not allow him to work on the seventh day, and therefore, since he must work on Sunday in order to make a week's work, it follows that his conscience obliges him to work on Sunday. His conscientious convictions of duty, first to God, and then to his family, will not allow him to do otherwise. Now if that man shall be punished for his Sunday labor, his punishment will be nothing but persecution for conscience sake. His punishment is solely on the ground that his religion differs from that of his neighbor. This charge cannot by any possibility be refuted. We say that work under such circumstances is necessary, no matter what the nature of the work is. Of course we except the disturbance of any congregation; that is not allowable on any day in the week.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.5*

Second, take the man who has not rested on the seventh day. He may make a profession of religion, or he may not. It matters not whether he violates his conscience by working seven days in the week or not. If he sins against God by working on Sunday, then he is answerable to God. Now if he be prosecuted for not keeping Sunday,—that is, for not conforming in that respect to the form of religion held by the majority,—his prosecution will be religious persecution just as much as in the case of a man who in a heathen country should be punished for ignoring the gods of that country. Put them in the best light you can, it is a fact that Sunday laws do

logically lead to religious persecution.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.6*

A few years ago there was a rigid Sunday law in Arkansas. When it was enacted, it was ostensibly for the sole purpose of closing up the liquor saloons. Did it stop with that? No; it did not even begin with that. Not a saloon was closed; but quite a number of peaceable farmers were persecuted almost to the death. You may say that that persecution was only the work of bigoted persons. Granted; but are you sure that there are no bigoted persons in California? And are you ready to pass a law that will give bigots the power to persecute inoffensive citizens?*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.7*

Another indictment: The petition calls for the prohibiting of all barbarous amusements on Sunday. Under this head would be classed prize fighting, cock fighting, and bull fighting. But in this petition the Woman's Christian Temperance Union shows itself to be far behind the times, and behind public sentiment, for there is a law prohibiting such things every day in the week. We have very distinct recollection of reading of several instances in which the police made a raid upon parties engaged in such barbarous sports. The framers of this petition may say that they know this. Then their petition is an insult to the law, in that it asks for its enforcement only on Sunday. In any case, they virtually declare by their petition that barbarous sports are not objectionable, provided they are not indulged in on Sunday. We cannot agree with them; and we believe that in this respect our legislators, even though they be non-professors; will show themselves to be ahead of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. We do not believe that they will enact a law that will virtually legalize barbarous sports six days in the week.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.8*

One word more, concerning the matter of closing saloons. When, we urge that such a law as is desired virtually sanctions the keeping open of saloons on six days of the week, we are told that the law is demanded in a special manner on Sunday, because people are idle then, and there is more opportunity for them to be decoyed into the saloon. The fallacy of this plea may be seen by the fact that people are no more idle on Sunday than they are at night during the week, and especially on Saturday night after six o'clock. Many a laboring

man spends all his wages on Saturday night, yet the petition makes no note of this. The simple fact is this, and it cannot be denied, that they want to have Sunday strictly observed as a day of rest and worship; and all the plea that the law is desired in behalf of temperance, is nothing but a blind. It has not the first principle of temperance in it. We believe that the law-makers of this State are too intelligent to be deceived by any such pretensions.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.9*

We have made this article long enough, and have only considered the *face* of the petition, and that is not half of the document. We shall consider the remainder of it elsewhere, under the head of, "The Back of that Petition."*AMS February 6, 1889, page 18.10*

E. J. W.

**"Why the California Sunday Law Was Repealed" American Sentinel 4, 3.**

E. J. Waggoner

The Oakland *Tribune* of January 19, in announcing a call for a meeting to be held on Tuesday evening, January 22, in the interest of a State Sunday law, used the following language:—*AMS February 6, 1889, page 20.1*

"Ever since the repeal of the California Sunday law, the Christian people of the State have been dissatisfied. This is the only State in the Union wholly without law in reference to the Christian Sabbath. It is believed that if the voice of the people could have been taken at the time of the act of the Legislature repealing the law, a very large majority of the best citizens in the State would have opposed the repeal, and they would now favor the enactment of a similar law. It is known that in the Legislature now in session, a new bill, not unlike the former, will be introduced, and its enactment is not very improbable. If the people could vote, it no doubt would become law. In view of such facts, the call of a public meeting in our city is timely."*AMS February 6, 1889, page 20.2*

From the above, a stranger would get the idea that the repeal of the California Sunday law six years ago was an underhanded

proceeding,—that it was sprung on the people when they were not thinking, and carried through before they had a chance to protest. As a matter of fact, the case was exactly the reverse of this. The matter was before the people for nearly a year. Following is a brief history of the case:—*AMS February 6, 1889, page 20.3*

Some of the church people sought to rigidly enforce the Sunday law. They entered into it with enthusiasm, and thought they saw success just ahead. Some of them made boasts of what they would do to those who had the presumption to work on their Sabbath. Arrests were made by the wholesale. A few convictions were obtained in different parts of the State, for the movement was general. One or two cases were appealed to the Supreme Court. Thus the matter attracted the attention of everybody, and the eyes of many in distant States were turned toward California.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 21.1*

Of course there was opposition. It was the year of a State election, and the Republican party of California espoused the Sunday cause. At the State Convention a plank in favor of the Sunday law was adopted with the greatest enthusiasm. No other plank in the platform received one-fourth the attention or applause that that one did. When the Democratic Convention was held, that party declared for the repeal of the law. This was the sole issue between the two parties in California that year, and the campaign was a most exciting one. For months the principal topic of conversation was the Sunday law. The papers were full of it, and there was not a political speech made in which it was not discussed. The ministers all preached on it. Everywhere it was the one thing before the people.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 21.2*

Of course every voter turned out on election day. The result was that a Democratic Governor and a Democratic Legislature was elected. The State Government, which had previously been strongly Republican, became by that election just as strongly Democratic. Everybody knew that it was because of the Sunday law. The Republican party well knew that its defeat was due to its espousal of the Sunday law. The first thing that the Democratic Legislature did when it convened, was to fulfill its pledge to repeal that law. The members could not in conscience do otherwise, because their

promise to do so was that which accured their election. That is the whole history.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 21.3*

And now for the *Tribune* to say that “it is believed that if the voice of the people could have been taken at the time of the act of the Legislature repealing the law, a very large majority of the best citizens in the State would have opposed the repeal,” is arrant nonsense. The one who believes that, will believe anything. If the voice of the people is not heard at the polls, especially when the main issue has been the subject of discussion for months, then we should like to know how that voice could be heard. Everybody who has lived in California for the last seven years, or who was here during the campaign of 1882, knows that we have related the simple facts. The California Sunday law was repealed because the majority of the people said that they wanted it repealed. Whether or not the sentiment of the majority has changed materially since then, remains to be seen. Let the matter have a fair trial before the people, and if the majority want a Sunday law, it will appear. But let no one seek to appeal to sympathy by pleading that a fair trial was not had six years ago.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 21.4*

We are well aware of the fact that an effort is being made to push the matter of a Sunday law through this Legislature as quickly and quietly as possible; but we shall do our part towards securing a full and free discussion of it. Of the meeting to influence legislation in behalf of the Sunday law, we shall have something to say next week.*AMS February 6, 1889, page 21.5*

E. J. W.



## February 13, 1889

“Sunday Law Meeting in Oakland” *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

The meeting held in Hamilton Hall, Tuesday evening, January 22, in the interest of a Sunday law in California, was a very tame affair. The speakers read or recited their pieces in a perfunctory manner, having the appearance of men somewhat discouraged. Although they have little or no hope of getting any satisfaction at this session of the Legislature, they showed very clearly the spirit that underlies their movement, and the nature of the law that they want, and that is all that we are concerned about. *AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.1*

Dr. M. C. Briggs, of Santa Clara, and Dr. Dwinelle, of the Pacific Theological Seminary, were the speakers of the evening. In his opening prayer, Dr. Dwinelle prayed that the State might be awakened to the necessity of making Sunday not only a day of rest, but of moral quickening as well. In his remarks, he said: “The whole business of the community must cease practically, in order that all may have the benefit of the rest day.” That is to say, that the Doctor does not and cannot rest on Sunday, unless everybody else stops work. The untruthfulness of such a statement should be apparent to all. Thousands of people in the United States and in Europe, who rest on the seventh day, and who enjoy their rest and worship, and get all the benefit from it that there is in a rest day, show clearly enough that it is not necessary to have a law compelling everybody to rest, in order to accommodate a few. *AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.2*

Dr. Briggs’s speech was mostly a labored theological argument. It would be utterly useless to report him in this, for two reasons. First, because theology has nothing to do with the matter. If the Doctor could read on every page of the Bible a plain declaration that Sunday ought to be kept as the Sabbath, it would not have a particle of bearing on the matter of a State Sunday law. The State has no business to legislate in matters pertaining only to God; and second, because the Doctor stumbled so much over Hebrew roots,

that his efforts excited only pity.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.3*

He did treat us to one brilliant, original piece of Biblical exegesis. Speaking of the phrase, “the morrow after the Sabbath,” which occurs a few times in connection with the Passover, he said: “The morrow after the Sabbath, is mentioned all the way along as following the Sabbath.” His conclusion was, that Sunday is the Sabbath! When such arguments as that are hurled at us our only refuge is silence. This may be taken as a fair sample of the arguments by which the necessity for Sunday laws is shown; and since it is less than nothing, we are driven to the conclusion that force of numbers will be the all-prevailing argument in taking away the liberties of the people.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.4*

When he struck the New Testament, he didn't venture any such original thoughts, but contented himself with retailing the stale argument on the Greek of *Matthew 28:1*, and similar passages, where the word “week” is rendered from *Sabbaton*. The Doctor asserted that that text should read “the first of the Sabbaths,” instead of “the first day of the week.” This assertion was made with as much boldness as though all the scholarship of the world were not against such a rendering. Any Greek scholar or lexicon will tell him that the word *Sabbaton* has the meaning of “week,” as well as of “Sabbath.”*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.5*

While the Doctor was dwelling on this, we thought that we would like to quote to him *Luke 18:12*, where the Pharisee in the temple is represented as saying in his prayer, “I fast twice in the week.” Here the same word is rendered “week” as in *Matthew 28:1*; and according to Dr. Briggs's theory of exposition, the text ought to read, “I fast twice in the Sabbath.” Just imagine that well-fed Pharisee clasping his hands aldermanic sides, while he sanctimoniously raised his eyes, and said to the Lord: “I thank thee that I am not as other men are, for I abstain from eating twice every Sabbath-day”! This is absurd, but no more so than the renderings given by Dr. Briggs; so we may dismiss his Scripture argument.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.6*

When the Doctor came right down to the matter of a civil law compelling men to keep Sunday whether or no, he was more at

home, and spoke with more freedom. Said he, "We don't want to make men religious." How often that is reiterated. One would think that there was nothing that these civil Sunday-law preachers dreaded so much as making men religious. He said that the Sunday law is designed only as a measure of protection to those who are dependent on others; a police regulation; a sanitary arrangement." We can well believe that if it is ever enacted it will be a police regulation, and that is just what we oppose. We don't want any police regulation of religious matters. As to sanitary arrangements, we would have more confidence in them if they originated with the medical fraternity, instead of the preachers.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.7*

Only one thing more need be noted, and that is, his reason why there must be a law compelling everybody to rest on the same day. Said he, "If every man is at liberty to choose his own day of rest, my neighbor who doesn't keep my day will work on my day, while I want to rest. So there must be one day for the whole community."*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.8*

There you have an expression of the mean selfishness out of which all Sunday laws spring. "My neighbor will work on my day, unless there is a law compelling him to observe it." Very likely; but how about Doctor Briggs? Will he not work on the day on which his neighbor wants to rest? Why, of course; but then, "what rights has my neighbor, that I am bound to respect? *I'm* in the majority." We don't wonder that men become infidels, when Doctors of Divinity, who profess to be living exponents of Christianity, show such an unrighteous disregard for the rights and feelings of others. The gospel which they teach is one which says, "Whatsoever ye would not that your neighbor should do to you, that do you to him if you feel like it and have the power."*AMS February 13, 1889, page 26.9*

We are happy to inform our friends that Christianity has nothing in common with such teaching. Christianity leads men to be considerate of others; and if a man is weak and in the minority, that is the very one whom true Christianity would seek out and protect. As we left the meeting, musing on the heartlessness of the men who are clamoring for Sunday laws, we could think only of these words, "O my soul, come not thou into their secret, unto their

assembly; mine honor, be not thou united.” *AMS February 13, 1889, page 27.1*

E. J. W.

**“A Sign of the Times” American Sentinel 4, 4.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of November 29 had an article copied from the *Christian Intelligencer*, about the amount of business done by photographers on Sunday. Following are a few paragraphs from it, which will serve to show the drift of sentiment in regard to such labor:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.1*

“It is hardly probable that the Christian people of this city are aware of the extent to which the Sabbath is violated by the photographers. Many of the principal galleries are filled with waiting patrons, and their largest business is done on the Sabbath.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.2*

“The famous galleries, although not exactly open to the public, are ready to make appointments, and prefer that day to execute the pictures of the popular actors, singers, etc.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.3*

“And most of the small places, after passing a dull week, erect to make up on the Sunday business enough to give them a profit over the week’s expenses.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.4*

“There is a wholesome law against this transact tug business on the holy day, but it is not enforced.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.5*

“A few years ago an attempt was made to close up the violators of the Sabbath, but it was not successful, and several of the prominent men in that effort, seeing no remedy, now keep open, and find their purses better filled, their bank account much larger, and their credit much better with the stock dealer. Now in view of this truthful statement, what is the duty of the Christian public in this matter?”*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.6*

The article carries with it its own answer to the last question, that is, from the standpoint of the *Statesman* and the *Intelligencer*.AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.7

The plainly implied demand is that such business should be stopped by law. And this indicates to what lengths the instigators of the Sunday-law movement will go when they have secured the legislation which they want, and have the power in their hands. It shows that a system of *espionage* will be inaugurated, and that nobody's privacy will be sacred from the prying intrusion of the minions of such an iniquitous law.AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.8

There is no business that is conducted with more quietness than the business of photography. Nothing is less calculated to disturb public worship or private devotion. Even a monk in his cloister could not be disturbed by the business of a photographer next door, if he were not informed of its proximity.AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.9

When the photographer may be arrested for quietly conducting his work in an upper room on Sunday, then no person will be exempt. Some zealous individual, anxious for political preferment, will find out that the merchant is in his private office on Sunday, looking over his ledger, and forthwith the merchant will be arrested. The lady who takes in sewing may be arrested for making button-holes or fitting a garment in her back parlor, on Sunday. The literary man who writes for hire may be arrested for quietly working at his desk on Sunday. In short, from such a wholesale stoppage of Sunday work as is desired by the *Statesman*, the *Intelligencer*, and all who may be classed as National Reformers, it will be but a step to the arresting of every citizen who is found away from church on Sunday, unless detained by sickness. That this is not an exaggerated conclusion is evident from the statement of Dr. Herrick Johnson, that he longed for the breath of the Puritan, for the Puritan Sabbath; and this is just what was done in the days of the Covenanters and Puritans. Robert Wodrow, a Scotch ecclesiastical historian, of whom it is said that his "veracity was above suspicion," and of his writings, that "no historical facts are better ascertained than the accounts ... to be found in Wodrow," makes the following

statement concerning the methods used to secure attendance at church:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 28.10*

“It is thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session pas throw the towne everie Sabbath day; and nott aie as they find absent fra the sermones other afoir or efter none; and for that effect that they pas and aerehe sic houss as they think moist melt.”—*Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.1*

In modern English this is as follows:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.2*

“It is thought expedient that one bailiff with two of the session pass through the town every Sabbath day, and note such as they find absent from the sermons either before or after noon; and for that effect that they pass and search such houses as they think most meet.”*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.3*

In his “Collections” he says: “The session allows the searchers to go into houses, and apprehend absents from the kirk.” Now when one of the great cries for a Sunday law is because people do not go to church, and when the only ground for stopping a photographer from working in the seclusion of his own room, could be that he was staving from church and at least inviting others to do so, the conclusion is inevitable that when the clamorers for a Sunday law get what they want, they will make no scruple of going into any house where they have reason to suspect that anybody is working on Sunday, and arresting the occupants.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.4*

Are we not warranted in saying that the liberties of the American people are in danger? Is it not high time that the people were awakening to the alarming growth of the religious legislation evil? Who will protest against the degeneracy of Protestantism?*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.5*

E. J. W.

“Showing Its Parentage” *American Sentinel* 4, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

In the (Detroit) *Christian Herald's* brief report of the National Sunday Convention at Washington, the President, Col. Elliott F. Shepard, is reported as having said that "Congress and the law-making powers in this country have virtually repealed the fourth commandment." By this he of course referred to the failure to enforce Sunday observance. It is not our intention to make any argument on what is plain enough without, namely, that Sunday and the fourth commandment have nothing whatever to do with each other; that we pass for the present. But taking him on his supposition, that repealing the fourth commandment would affect Sunday, we wish to point out sharply the position which the National Sunday Union proposes to assume. Note well the following:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.6*

Allowing that the failure to enact laws compelling people to keep Sunday, or the repealing of those already in existence, is a virtual repeal of the fourth commandment, then it follows that in their efforts to secure the enactment and enforcement of such laws, they are working for the re-enactment of the fourth commandment. Is not that a logical conclusion? Certainly it is, and Colonel Shepard, as the representative of the Union, would admit it. Then mark this point:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.7*

It was the Lord Jehovah who spoke the fourth commandment, with the other nine, from Sinai. It was God who enacted that law. Therefore the National Sunday Union, consisting of the National Reform Association, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and various religious organizations, in proposing to re-enact the fourth commandment, is proposing to put itself in the place of God. Not only so, but it is putting itself above God, by assuming that it is more competent to vindicate his law than he is himself. In this it is showing itself a true child of the Papacy, that "man of sin," the "son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Is not the likeness perfect? In other words, Is it not trying to make of this nation an *image* of the Papal beast? E. J. W.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 29.8*

E. J. Waggoner

Our National Reform friends, and all who are laboring so zealously to secure a Sunday law, have a good deal to say about our opposition to such a law. They accuse us of joining with infidels, and with those who are not in harmony with law and order and good government. As a matter of fact, we have not joined with anybody in our opposition to Sunday laws. We are against such laws, because we know that the State has no right to legislate concerning matters of religion, and because we know that such laws are unjust, and oppressive, and contrary to the spirit of true Christianity. If anybody else sees the injustice of such laws, and opposes their passage, or works against them on any ground whatever, we have no objection to make. This is a free country yet, and will continue to be so until National Reformers secure the control of it. We do not oppose Sunday legislation by the State because somebody else does; if everybody else should favor such laws, we should oppose them just the same.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.1*

But we cannot see that National Reformers are in a position to denounce us very much because we oppose the same thing that men do who are not Christians. On the ground that people who live in glass houses should not throw stones, it becomes them to be cautious. In the *Lutheran Observer's* enthusiastic report of the Sunday Convention held in Washington, we find this statement: —*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.2*

“The church in which the convention was held was festooned with petitions from probably ten millions of people, representing Protestant and Papal churches, labor unions, saints, and sinners.”*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.3*

No truer statement was ever made than this last. We venture the assertion that if the facts could be known, it would appear that the sinners outnumbered the saints in the proportion of ten to one. Yet the saints (?) who are engineering the Sunday movement are perfectly willing and very anxious to receive the co-operation of those very sinners, while they endeavor to heap contempt on us



because some who do not profess to be Christians happen to oppose their work. Truly, consistency is a jewel not found among National Reformers or their allies.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.4*

The *Congregationalist*, also, in its issue of December 20, 1888, said of this effort to secure Sunday legislation:—*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.5*

“A thing to be noted specially is that the movement affords ground for, and already has secured of a large degree, the support of many who work for purely secular ends.”*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.6*

They claim to be doing gospel work, and yet they bid for the support of those who have no interest in the gospel, but who from professedly selfish motives. Polluk describes one who stole the livery of the court of Heaven to serve the devil in. This looks to us very much like stealing the devil’s tools to serve the Lord with. Anything to win! seems to be their motto. It is a common saying, that politics makes strange bed-fellows, and National Reform politics differ in no respect from the rule.*AMS February 13, 1889, page 30.7*

E. J. W.

## February 20, 1889

**“A Tangible Object” American Sentinel 4, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

The following letter was received from a gentleman in the State of New York. We print it entire, in order that all who have similar ideas may receive the benefit of our reply:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.1*

EDITOR OF SENTINEL:—Dear Sir: Someone is kind enough to send your paper to me. In it I find much to admire, but some things which to my mind militate against your general object—the correction of existing evils in society.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.2*

I believe there is such a thing as the true church of Christ; but that it is not the Roman Catholic, nor the Greek, nor the Protestant Episcopal, nor the Methodist Episcopal, nor the Presbyterian, nor the Baptist, nor the Congregational, nor any other humanly constituted organization; but that it has in its membership all true believers in the Lord Jesus Christ as their present Saviour from sin, and who, by virtue of his faith, are saved, regenerated, made new creatures in him, and who, consequently, are living out his life among men. This body of people, for they are “one body,” I believe to be the “little stone cut out of the mountain without hands,” which, increasing in magnitude with an ever-accelerated momentum, is to subdue all opposed to it, until it fills and rules the whole earth. Of the rule of such a church, there must be no fear.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.3*

Human laws and institutions must, therefore, more and more conform to the divine, as this divinely constituted church goes forward in its mission of subduing and assimilating all things to its own likeness. Already as the divine law prohibits theft, and adultery, and murder, etc., so also do our human laws. And quite recently we have conformed our human Constitution to the divine in making it repeat the command, “Let the oppressed go free.” And now again the nation is rising up to prohibit that which, legalized as it now is, virtually legalizes theft, and adultery, and murder, and every other

abomination which only men under the influence of strong drink are capable of, thus giving a new and most striking evidence of the purpose and power of the "little stone" to subdue all things to itself.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.4*

This result achieved, and the final conquest will be near at hand; for the little demons, seeing their great leader slain, will take to their heels and fly away, leaving the field in possession of its rightful Lord and Law-Giver, and the universal shout shall go up, "Allelujah, the Lord omnipotent reigneth. The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.5*

Our correspondent is mistaken in his supposition that the "general object" of the SENTINEL is "the correction of existing evils in society." This is not its object; it has never contemplated so impossible a task. Its sole object is, as stated, in its prospectus, "the defense of American institutions, the preservation of the United States Constitution as it is, so far as regards religion or religious tests, and the maintenance of human rights, both civil and religious." This is the sole work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. There are plenty of papers devoted wholly to showing the evils of intemperance, and to working in other lilies of reform; but the SENTINEL is comparatively alone in calling attention to the evils of religious legislation, and to the imminent danger which this country is in because of it. That even in its special field it will be able to prevent bigoted and selfish, and well-meaning but deceived men from passing unjust and oppressive laws, its editors are not vain enough to imagine; their highest hope is, by warning people of impending danger, to arouse those who love real liberty to take a stand for it-to keep them from being taken by surprise. The work of a sentinel is to warn people of danger, so that they may be prepared to meet it. In this case, the danger to which we refer, is not so much that of being oppressed by unjust laws, as it is of being a party to the passing and the execution of such laws. The man who is persecuted for conscience sake, is in a far better state than the man who either directly or indirectly contributes to that end.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.6*

As to the existing evils in society, we have no idea that they will

ever be corrected until the end of the world. Our correspondent has stated a view that is quite generally accepted, namely, that the church of Christ will advance and increase in strength and numbers until it will finally swallow up everything, and fill the whole earth, and that when the church has corrected all the evils of society, and the world has become morally perfect, then the Lord himself will come and reign over his people. This is essentially the National Reform view, for it has been declared that the triumph of National Reform would be the ushering in of the millennium. The National Reform view differs from the one that has been taught in the past, only in the way that the millennium shall be brought about. It was formerly taught that this would be done by the preaching of the gospel; but National Reformers find that way too slow; they find that the world of vice is gaining ground, and that morality is losing; and so they propose to convert the world by an act of Congress and of other law-making bodies, and so have it all done at once. This view is now superseding the old one. It comes, therefore, strictly within our province to show from the Scriptures that such a result as they look for is chimerical in the highest degree. *AMS February 20, 1889, page 33.7*

1. In the first place, it is contrary to all the history of the past, that all the world should ever be converted. It is true that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, but it is only so to those who believe; and there is no more reason to suppose that all the world will believe in this age, than that all should believe in some past age. The gospel was as much the power of God unto salvation in the days of Noah, and of Abraham, and of the apostles, as it is now, yet but very few of the inhabitants of the world believed in those days. This is not because the gospel was at fault, but because men would not believe. If all men would believe, the gospel would save them from sin; but it is not the work of the gospel to force men to believe. "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely," is the gospel cry; but the mass of mankind have ever been the willing servants of sin, and so their minds have been blinded to the glorious light of the gospel. All men might have been healed, both in body and soul, when Jesus was on earth, if they had cared for the simple yet glorious truths which he spoke; but he was compelled mournfully to say, even to his own people, "Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life." The preaching of the apostles, fired as it was with

the zeal of Pentecost, was able to turn but very few of the people of the world to righteousness. Are they not presumptuous, then, who imagine that they can accomplish what never has been accomplished?*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.1*

2. Jesus said to his disciples: “enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life; and few there be that find it.” *Matthew 7:13, 14.AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.2*

The reason why so few will be saved, is because so few want to be, and not because of any lack on the part of God or his gospel. The way to life is narrow; that is, there is only one way to do right; but the way to death is broad; for there are many ways of doing wrong. It is much easier, much more in accordance with natural inclination to do wrong, and God has foreseen that most people will follow their own inclination. It has ever been so, and the Scriptures declare that it will be so to the end of time.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.3*

3. Paul wrote to Timothy, and through him to us, as follows:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.4*

“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” *2 Timothy 3:1-5.AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.5*

Here is a list of sins almost identical with those ascribed to the ancient heathen (*Romans 1:28-32*), and all are to be prevalent in the last days. Surely this does not look as though the church is to be able, either by legal or moral suasion, to correct the existing evils of society*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.6*

4. We have a still stronger testimony than this. In Christ’s discourse upon the time of his second coming, he said:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.7*

“And so it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of man. They did eat, they drank, they married wives, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all. Likewise also as it was in the days of Lot; they did eat, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they builded; but the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of man is revealed.” *Luke 17:26-30.AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.8*

Since the world when the Lord comes is to be like it was in the days of Noah and Lot, it is going to grow worse instead of better, for “the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly” (*Genesis 13:13*), and before the flood “God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” *Genesis 6:5.AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.9*

If space allowed, we might add many like Scripture testimonies, but these are sufficient. The true church, as our correspondent says, is indeed composed of all those who truly believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and who by virtue of their faith in him are regenerated, and made new creatures; but it is not the province of the church to correct the evils of society. When the church gets that idea, it begins to pass laws to make men religious, or rather, to make men act as though they were religious, and then it ceases to be the church of Christ. The church is simply to be a light to the world, to exhibit the character of Jesus. But if the church begins to use the civil power to carry forward its work, it ceases to represent Christ, for he did not do so. The gospel is to be preached in all the world for a *witness* unto all nations, and with that its work ceases. A witness is not a prosecutor, nor a judge; and when the existing evils of society shall be corrected by the destruction of them that corrupt the earth, the gospel will have ceased its work. Sentence is never pronounced nor executed until after the witness has finished his testimony. And so those who think that to punish men for not serving God, is a part of the gospel, show that they do not know what the gospel is. They cease to be ambassadors for Christ, and usurp the place of Christ himself, as judge.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.10*

The few Scripture texts and arguments that have been given are sufficient to show the fallacy of the whole of our friend's letter. It is Christ himself, and not the church, that is the rock that is to grind men to powder. It is not by the conversion of the whole world, against their will, that the earth is to be made the abode of peace, but by the utter destruction of those who will not obey God. The kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; but it is God the Father, and not the church, that gives them to the Son. And when they are given to him, it is not as converted nations, asking "What is the word that cometh forth from the Lord?" but it is as thorns fit only to be burnt; "reprobate silver," because the Lord hath rejected them, to be "broken with a rod of iron, and dashed in pieces like a potter's vessel." *AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.11*

We would only add, in closing, that the Constitution of the United States is not conformed to the divine. If it were, we should not want it preserved as it is. Not because we are not in harmony with the divine constitution, but because we don't think men are capable of administering a divine constitution. The amendment prohibiting slavery was in the line of simple justice between men, and for the good of society. We believe in a divine Government, highest aim to be loyal subjects of it; but we don't want it administered by human deputies and we are glad to know that God does not rule by proxy, but executes his own decrees. The work of the SENTINEL is no less to keep people from laying profane hands on sacred things, then it is to preserve the American Constitution as it is; and so, while we are laboring in the interest of human rights, we are to the same extent laboring for the preservation of the purest Christianity. *AMS February 20, 1889, page 34.12*

E. J. W.

**"Provisions of the Sunday Rest Bill" American Sentinel 4, 5.**

E. J. Waggoner

We are persuaded that there is a great deal of misunderstanding in regard to the Blair bills, not only among those who are opposed to religious legislation, but by those who are at least nominally

favoring them. We have seen and heard the statement that the Sunday-Rest bill would, if it should become a law, shut down all business throughout the country. This is a mistake. The passage of the Sunday-Rest bill would have a direct effect upon only a comparatively small portion of the people of the United States, although it would very seriously affect them indirectly. The first section of that bill reads as follows:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.1*

*“Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That on Sunday, no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe, of any person or corporation; shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, show, exhibition, or amusement in public, in any Territory, District, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section”**AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.2*

This section confines the working of the bill, if it should become a law, to those places that are “subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.” These are the Territories and the District of Columbia. It is an absolute law for the Territories, making no exception, but obliging everybody to rest on Sunday.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.3*

Section 2 reads as follows:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.4*

*“That no mails or mail matter shall hereafter be transported in times of peace over any land postal route, nor shall any mail matter be collected, assorted, handled, or delivered during any part of the first day of the week.”**AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.5*

This is so plain as to need no comment. The third section reads as follows:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.6*

*“That the prosecution of commerce between the States, and with the Indian tribes, by the transportation of persons by land or water on the first day of the week, is hereby prohibited, and any person or*



corporation, or the agent or employe of any person or corporation, who shall violate this section, shall be punished by a fine of not less than ten nor more than one thousand dollars; and no service performed in the prosecution of such prohibited commerce shall be lawful, nor shall any compensation be recoverable or be paid, for the same.”*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.7*

This shuts off inter-State commerce. By the first section, overland trains would be stopped in the Territories, but this section prohibits all Sunday traffic between States, whether on land or water. The reader can readily see what bearing such a law as this would have on State Sunday legislation.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.8*

Section 3 provides for cessation of labor on Sunday in the army and navy, prohibiting all drills, musters, and parades, except in time of active service or preparation therefore. Section 5 makes exception in case of labor or service performed or rendered on Sunday in consequence of accident or disaster or unavoidable delay in making the regular connections upon postal routes and routes of transportation, and allows for the transportation and delivery of milk before 5 A. M., and after 10 P. M. This is the whole of the bill, so far as its prohibition of labor is concerned. It will be seen that it is very strict as far as its jurisdiction extends, but it does not directly affect citizens of the States, except Government employes.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 35.9*

But its indirect effect in the States will be scarcely less than its direct effect in places subject to the exclusive control of the United States. It is well known that the great obstacle in the way of enforcing existing Sunday laws in the various States, has been the United States Government. In the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, December 13, Mrs. Bateham said that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union based their claims and petitions on the following facts:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.1*

“1. Nearly every State has Sabbath laws, but the National Government has none, though greatly needed, since the question has become emphatically a national one, and the very perpetuity or loss of our national rest, the Christian Sabbath, seems to depend

on its being protected by the Government from the encroachments of organized capital, and the reinforcements of State laws by National.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.2*

“2. It is in gross violation of nearly every State Sabbath law, that railroads run their Sunday trains, yet these States are powerless to prevent it, since only Congress can control inter-State commerce.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.3*

“3. By the State laws ordinary labor and traffic is forbidden on Sunday, but in defiance thereof the United States Government keeps its post-offices open and sells as on other days, and sends its mail to all parts of the country.”—*Report, p. 22.AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.4*

It will be seen that the plea for a National Sunday law is made on the ground that the State Sunday laws are powerless without it. In that same committee meeting, Senator Blair, the chairman, stated that the General Government takes advantage of what the States have given to it in the way of jurisdiction over the post-offices, inter-State commerce, and the army and navy, to introduce practices that nullify their attempt to enforce Sunday laws, and said:—*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.5*

“To prevent this, is the object of this legislation. That is all that is undertaken here. It is simply an act proposing to make efficient the Sunday-Rest laws of the States, and nothing else.”—*Report, p. 97.AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.6*

We shall hereafter take occasion to show how terribly “efficient” some of those Sunday laws will become when this Sunday-Rest bill becomes a law.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.7*

National Reformers have ever referred to the general Government as the great Sabbath-breaker, holding that running of mail trains, and the keeping open of post-offices practically nullified all their efforts to have Sunday strictly observed. With this objection removed, there would be speedy and strict enforcement of the Sunday-laws that already exist, and enactment of laws where there are none now. The passage of the bill, therefore, would practically result, as was said at the National Sunday Convention, in making

Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, to be occupied only by worship. It should be opposed by everybody; by those who do not care to observe Sunday, as a matter of course, and because it is unjust and un-American; and by those who do care to observe Sunday, both from the standpoint of the golden rule, and because they should protest against having their worship from choice made to appear as though it was a matter of compulsion.*AMS February 20, 1889, page 36.8*

E. J. W.

## February 27, 1889

**“Subjection to the Powers That Be” American Sentinel 4, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.”

*Romans 13:1, 2.AMS February 27, 1889, page 41.1*

This text of Scripture has been the cause of a great deal of controversy concerning the scope of civil governments, and the relations which Christians should sustain to them. There are a great many people who take the extreme view that whatever civil governments enact should be scrupulously obeyed, no matter how much it may conflict with the will of God, as revealed in the Bible. They seem to imagine that God has delegated all power to men, and that he waives to the claims of men his right to govern in matters of morals. They virtually say that the inspired command to be subject to the higher powers, absolves people from direct allegiance to their Creator. The very statement of the case should be enough to show anybody the absurdity of such a view.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 41.2*

The thirteenth chapter of Romans affords in itself ample proof that the powers that be are ordained of God only in matters that pertain to the outward peace of society. But we wish to bring a few other Scriptures to bear, to show just how we are to be subject to earthly powers, and at the same time be subject to the highest power of all.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 41.3*

The seventh verse of the same chapter says: “Render therefore to all their due: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.” Render “honor to whom honor” is due, is a part of this command. Now it is beyond question that honor is due to God, for the Lord himself says that he will honor only those who honor him. *1 Samuel 2:30*. And that this tribute and honor which are due to God are entirely different from

those which are due to earthly governments, is evident from the words of Christ to the Pharisees, which are exactly parallel with those of Paul to the Romans: "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." *Matthew 22:21*. Thus we see that while we are to be subject to the earthly powers, that subjection must in nowise conflict with our subjection to God. *AMS February 27, 1889, page 41.4*

That inspiration does not teach that men are in duty bound to obey every edict of earthly powers, but that they are to disobey every enactment which conflicts with the law of God, is very plain. Take the case of the three Hebrew children at the court of Nebuchadnezzar. They were as truly bound to be subject to him as ever any men were to an earthly ruler, for Nebuchadnezzar was king by God's own appointment (*Jeremiah 27:4-7*), and they had by the same power been placed under him. Yet when the king commanded them to worship an image which he had set up, they absolutely refused to do anything of the kind. For their stubbornness, as the king doubtless thought it, they were cast into a fiery furnace; yet God who commands us to be subject to the powers that be, showed his approval of their course in the most marked manner. *AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.1*

Take the case of Daniel in the court of Darius. That king made a decree that for thirty days no man should make a request of any god or man except himself, under penalty of being cast into a den of lions. But Daniel paid no manner of attention to the decrees. When he knew that the writing was signed, "he went into his house; and his windows being opened in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime." *Daniel 6:10*. Like his three fellows, he made no secret of his disobedience to the king's order. Yet the same God who commands us to be subject to the powers that be, showed his approval of Daniel's course by delivering him from the lions, and honoring him before the whole empire. *AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.2*

The apostles afford another case in point. An express injunction was laid upon them by the Jewish Sanhedrim "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus." *Acts 4:17, 18*. The apostles,

however, refused to keep silence, saying, “We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard” (*verse 20*), and they went right on teaching as though the rulers had said nothing. When they were again brought before the council, and reminded of the injunction which had been laid upon them, they boldly replied, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” *Acts 5:29*. All these cases, and especially this last, show that the command to be subject to the powers that be, does not mean that we should obey them when obedience to them involves disobedience to God.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.3*

Now the question arises, were these men subject to the Governments under which they lived? Can men be subject to the powers that be, and yet not obey them in every particular, no matter what they command? We answer that men can be subject to the powers that be, and still disobey them when their decrees conflict with the laws of God; and the record shows most clearly that Daniel and his fellows, and the apostles, were subject to the powers that existed in their time.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.4*

A passage from the writings of one of the men who refused to obey men, when to do so involved disloyalty to God, will make this matter clear. We quote from *1 Peter 2:17-20*:—*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.5*

“Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the King. Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward. For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.”*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.6*

The command to “honor the king” shows this to be a parallel passage to *Romans 13:1, 2*. Here, as there, we are exhorted to be subject to rulers, even though they be not good. But that this does not mean that we should in so doing disobey God, is evident from *verse 19*: “For this is thank-worthy if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.” The fact that he is called

upon to suffer wrongfully, and that he is buffeted because he does well, shows that his doing right has been in direct opposition to the commands of his master. He suffers “for conscience towards God.” That is, his conscience will not allow him to disobey God’s commandment in obedience to the powers that be, and so he patiently suffers for it. And although he cannot obey the master’s command, his patient acceptance of the threatened punishment shows his subjection to the power.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.7*

So we see that being subject to the powers that be, means simply that we are to obey them when their commands are right; and to disobey them when they conflict with those of God, and meekly to take the consequences. This is just what Daniel and his fellows and the apostles did. They did not resist, but they did not obey an unrighteous commandment. Now turn again to *Romans 13, verses 2 and 5*, and you will see that this is just what is taught. We quote: —*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.8*

“Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” “Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience’ sake.”*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.9*

The Bible everywhere teaches respect for authority. Anarchists can find no warrant in the Bible for any of their contempt for authority. Rebellion against authority is not countenanced under any circumstances. Every soul must be subject to the powers that be, and that subjection consists in willing, prompt obedience to all their laws when they do not require disregard of God’s law, and as willing an acceptance of the penalty for disobeying laws that do contravene the laws of God. An example of this is found in the early Christians, who took joyfully the spoiling of their goods. *Hebrews 10:34*. Where there cannot be obedience, there must not be resistance. David would not lift his hand against the king of Israel, even though that king was most unjustly seeking his life; Paul would not knowingly speak ill of the high priest, although that priest was a wicked hypocrite. He counseled the Christians to be subject to the powers that were, even while he was daily violating the laws of the most wicked ruler; and he showed his subjection to a power which

was despicable because of its moral rottenness, by willingly yielding up his life as the price of his necessary disobedience.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.10*

E. J. W.

**“Proposed Persecution in Tennessee” American Sentinel 4, 6.**

E. J. Waggoner

We learn that the following is being circulated western part of Tennessee:—*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.11*

NOTICE,

*“To whom it may concern:—AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.12*

That we, the undersigned citizens of the Texas neighborhood and vicinity, being desirous of the welfare of our community, and that peace may prevail, and that the morals of our children may not be insulted and trampled upon by willful violation of the Sunday laws of our land, do this day pledge our honor that we will individually and collectively prosecute each and every violation of our State law that may come under our observation.”*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.13*

That our readers may know just what will be the result of carrying out that pledge, we print the Tennessee Sunday law, which they propose to enforce. Here it is:—*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.14*

If any merchant, artificer, tradesman, farmer, or other person, shall be guilty of doing or exercising any of the common avocations of life, or of causing or permitting the same to be done by his children or servants, (acts of real necessity or charity excepted) on Sunday, he shall on due conviction on thereof before any justice of the peace of the county, forfeit and pay three dollars, one-half to the person who will sue for the same, the other half for the use of the county.”*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.15*

If the enforcement of that law would not be persecution, then we



don't know what would be. If any farmer shall be "guilty" of planting squashes behind his barn, or of hoeing corn in the back lot, down by the woods, on Sunday, he may be hauled up and fined. Yet we are gravely assured that Sunday laws are simply "sanitary arrangements," and are not intended to make men religious. We do not need to be informed that they are not intended to make men religious. such a law is calculated only to make anarchists hypocrites.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.16*

Sanitary arrangements, forsooth! What is there about the Sunday that makes it so much more dangerous to a man's health to dig potatoes or weed onions on it than on any other day? We propose to ring the changes on this matter until the people shall see the inconsistency, or the duplicity, whichever it is, of those who argue for Sunday laws. If they want sanitary regulations, let them try their hands at framing something that would indicate it. If they want what the laws they frame seem to indicate, then let them say so plainly, and we shall have far greater respect for them.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.17*

It may be said that the Tennessee law will never be enforced according to the strict letter of it, and that we have supposed an impossible case. But the fact is that less than three years ago, under the Tennessee Sunday law, men were arrested and fined and imprisoned for quietly digging potatoes on Sunday for dinner, and for pulling up weeds out of their garden. And this was not in town, where people might see the work while passing to or from church, but in remote country districts, where the informer had to go out of his way in order to see the Sunday work.*AMS February 27, 1889, page 42.18*

This fact, taken in connection with the last clause of the law, reminds us of another gross abuse that may be perpetrated. The law gives one-half the fine to the person who sues the Sunday worker. Vagabonds who have nothing to do but loaf around, may make a very fine thing for themselves by spying around the country, and peeping into shops to see who is working, and then lodging information against them. The Tennessee Sunday law is a disgrace to the State and to civilization, yet the reader will look in vain to see any denunciation of it by any National Reformer or advocate of a

Sunday law “for sanitary purposes only.” W.AMS *February 27, 1889, page 42.19*

## March 6, 1889

**“The Blair Education Amendment Bill” American Sentinel 4, 7.**

E. J. Waggoner

We promised some time ago to comment on Senator Blair’s remarks on this bill, but since then other matter which seemed more important has crowded it out. Now, although the bill has been twice printed in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we propose to print it again in connection with Mr. Blair’s remarks in the Senate, and to make such comments on both as will enable all to see just what is involved in the proposed amendment. The largely increased, circulation of the SENTINEL, since the bill was last printed, warrants and even makes necessary this repetition.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.1*

Before proceeding to the consideration of the bill, it may be well to read what some of the most prominent men in the United States think of the Constitution as it is. The New York *Independent*, without any reference to the Blair amendment, sent out letters asking the following question: “Has there been such advance in political science, and such development of this Nation, during the past hundred years, as to demand any considerable modification in our Constitution? If so, in what lines should it be made?” To this the following answers, which appeared in the *Independent*, January 10, 1889, were received from men who certainly need no instruction in the United States Constitution. We first quote the closing paragraph of a long reply by Francis Wharton, LL.D.:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.2*

“The Constitution itself requires no amendment; but what is required is the removal from it of the patches impairing its symmetry, its comprehensiveness, its elasticity, its durability, which have been imposed on it by the judiciary.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.3*

Hon. George Bancroft, the historian, who is as familiar with the Constitution as ordinary people are with the alphabet, said:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.4*

"I have your letter asking what changes had better be made in the Constitution. I know of none; if any change is needed, it is in ourselves, that we may more and more respect that body of primal law." *AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.5*

This is to the point, and we commend it to the careful consideration of National Reformers. It is they that need amendment; not the Constitution of the United States. The remaining answers are from judges of the United States Supreme Court, whose special business it is to be familiar with the Constitution. Justice Bradley wrote, "I would have no change" and then added:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.6*

"I think it is a most happy arrangement that sudden whiffs and gusts of popular feeling are not always able to execute and carry out the rash purposes with which they are inspired." *AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.7*

To the same intent is the following from Justice Gray:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.8*

"I am so old-fashioned as to think that the Constitution, administered according to its letter and spirit, is well enough as it is. And I am of the opinion of the late Governor Andrew, that it is not desirable to Mexicanize our Government by proposing constitutional amendments as often as there is supposed to be a disturbance in its practical working." *AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.9*

If the so-called Educational Amendment should be adopted, the flood-gates of religious legislation would be opened, and the Constitution of the United States would in time become little more than a church creed. This is not empty assertion, as will presently appear. *AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.10*

Justice Blatchford's letter to the *Independent*, which we quote in full, is as follows:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.11*

"I am satisfied with the Constitution as it is. It cannot be bettered. Constitution tinkers are in a poor business. If there are ills, it is better to bear them than fly to others that we know not of." *AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.12*

There you have the opinion of men whose business it is to make a special study of the Constitution of the United States. Surely it should be entitled to some weight. Reason should teach men that there cannot be any serious defect in a Constitution under which this Government has grown to an extent and with a rapidity unprecedented in the history of Nations. But we come now to the proposed amendment, which reads as follows:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.13*

*“Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:—AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.14*

ARTICLE—

“SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.15*

“SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the instruction of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization, or to any State, or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person, whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being, or claiming to be, religious in its character, or such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonial, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 49.16*

“Sec: 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve Governments republican in

form, and in substance, the United States shall guarantee to every State, and to the people of every State, and of the United States, the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.1*

“SEC. 4. That Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.2*

This joint resolution was introduced into the Senate on the 25th of May, 1888, and after being read twice, was ordered to lie on the table. It remained there until December 22, 1888, when Mr. Blair, having obtained the consent of the Senate, called it up, and had it referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.3*

The Charleston News and Courier has printed quite a number of letters from Southern college presidents and professors, concerning this bill, most of them favoring it on the ground that it would be a help to the Southern States. None of them look at the religious features of the bill, but only to the material help which it promises. It is this which will lead many to overlook the very objectionable clause in it; yet even this is condemned by some who are in the South, where the greatest benefit would be received in this line. Thus, Prof. C. F. Smith, of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee, says:—*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.4*

“At first I was favorably inclined to the bill, as I feared that most of the Southern States would not be able to bear the burden of illiteracy thrust upon them by the Civil War. I am now opposed to the bill on general principles. I do not believe that many of the Southern States really need this help. Granted, however, that in many, or even most of the Southern States, the immediate result would be good,—that is, that more men would, in the next few years, be able to read and write with this help than without it,—in the long run I fear we should be more injured than benefited. Unless States are different from individuals, the policy of helping them to do what, even with great effort, they might do for themselves, could only end in making them dependent.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.5*

President J. F. Crowell, of Trinity College, North Carolina, is in favor

of the bill because of the material help which will be afforded to the States, although he acknowledges that it is defective as a measure of financial administration, and on constitutional grounds, admitting that it will “stretch the Constitution till it cracks.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.6*

Prof. E. C. Woodward, of South Carolina College, Columbia, says: “The South needs additional educational facilities, but this bill does not offer the educational aid most needed by our people.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.7*

President W. S. Candler, of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia, says: —*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.8*

“In view of the sore need or more and better educational facilities in the South, I am strongly tempted to indorse the bill, but my judgment, unbiased by such considerations, is that the bill is not to be approved. I do not believe that the general Government is authorized to make any such appropriation to the cause of education. As to its possible effect on the South I cannot speak so confidently, but I fear it would be disappointing as a method of popular education, and, besides, would teach our people a parental view of this Government which would be vicious in its results. We need something more than money to educate the people, and there are many evils we can endure with less danger than we can invite a revolutionary departure from the constitutional functions of the National Government.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.9*

From the quotations already made, all of which have been copied from *Public Opinion*, January 26, 1889, it appears that the amendment is not to be commended even aside from its religious features, to which we shall now give attention. The second section is the one which contains the real point at issue. That requires each State to “establish and maintain a system of free public schools, adequate for the education of all the children living therein, between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion.”*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.10*

It would seem that the most superficial observer could see that this section is in direct opposition to the first, which ways that “no State

shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;" for it does provide for the establishment of a State religion. Some apologists for the bill have sought to evade this, by saying that the amendment does not require the States to maintain an establishment of religion, but only to maintain schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.11*

This is the thinnest kind of an evasion; for what would be the sense of maintaining schools adequate for the education of children in the principles of the Christian religion, if those principles were not taught? What is meant by "schools adequate for the education" of children in the principles of the Christian religion? Evidently, schools equipped with suitable text-books, and provided with teachers competent to give instruction in those principles. That would involve quite a change from our present school system, for our schools are not now capable of imparting such instruction. Now it is the height of folly to say that the Government would be at the expense of providing extra text-books and teachers, so as to make the schools adequate for the education of the children in the principles of religion, and yet not require any such instruction to be given. The very fact that the State is required to establish and maintain a system of schools adequate for the education of children in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion," shows that they would be expected to teach those principles, just as much as the common branches of knowledge.*AMS March 6, 1889, page 50.12*

E. J. W.

*(To be continued.)*



## March 13, 1889

**“Only the Name, Not the Power” American Sentinel 4, 8.**

E. J. Waggoner

A correspondent of the *Carrier Dove* says:—*AMS March 13, 1889, page 59.1*

“I say it in all seriousness, there is no name under heaven, the power of which we as a progressive people have greater reason to fear, than the name of Jesus, as used by religious people. It is the rallying-cry under which they are striving to unite Church and State; the claim is that he shall be the ruler of, not only this, but all Nations; the Sabbath bill is being backed by the power of Jesus’ name, and step by step we are thus being deprived of our liberties.”*AMS March 13, 1889, page 59.2*

This is only one of the things that the National Reformers and their allies are responsible for; but this is enough to stamp their whole scheme as antichristian. While they profess that theirs is a Christian movement, there is nothing else in the world that is doing so much to bring Christianity into disrepute. Just as the false Christianity of the Roman Catholic Church, which was accepted as true Christianity, was responsible for the infidelity of Paine and Voltaire, so this professed National Reform, which will be taken by many as being just what it pretends to be,—an exhibition of real Christianity,—will disgust many with the very name of Christ and Christianity.*AMS March 13, 1889, page 59.3*

We can tell our neighbor that although the name of Jesus is used very often by these would-be reformers, “the power of Jesus’ name” is altogether wanting. It matters not how much they may claim that he is to be king of this Nation, he himself has declared, “My kingdom is not of this world.” The power of Jesus’ name has never been exercised except for the benefit of the human race; but the mere name, the sound, has been used to back up crimes that would almost make a demon blush. It was the power of his name that healed the sick and raised the dead, in the days of the apostles. When, however, the sons of one Sceva, a Jew, thought to

accomplish the same wonders that the apostle did, by calling the name of Jesus over one possessed with a devil, the demon overcame them, and drove them from the house naked and wounded, proving to them that the name of Jesus without the power could accomplish nothing towards diminishing the woes of the world. National Reformers should learn a lesson from the seven sons of Sceva.*AMS March 13, 1889, page 59.4*

The “power of Jesus’ name” has done more than to raise the dead; it has enabled men to resist the strivings of appetite and passion, has delivered them from the bondage of vice and sin, so that they have stood free men, pure and clean, changed so greatly as scarcely to be able to recognize themselves. The power of the name of Jesus can and does diminish sin; but nobody can apply that power but Jesus himself. When men attempt to diminish sin by law, using the name of Jesus, they will find that they only increase it. Jesus does not have any vicegerents in this world, and his reign is a reign of love. National Reform Christianity is of the kind described by the apostle Paul, when he says that in the last days men shall be “lovers of their own selves,” etc., “having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.” From such we are exhorted to “turn away.”*AMS March 13, 1889, page 59.5*

E. J. W.

## March 20, 1889

**“The Blair Educational Amendment Bill. (Concluded.)” American Sentinel 4, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

*(Concluded.)*

3. It is utterly useless to talk about teaching the principles of the Christian' religion as one would teach the principles of arithmetic and geography. Such a thing cannot be. Those sciences are fixed. There is no chance for a difference of opinion in regard to them. They are the same in every nation and among all classes of religionists and men of no religion at all. An infidel could not possibly teach any different principles of arithmetic than a Christian would. But it is not so with religion. Even though it had been decided by vote of a council, what the principles of the Christian religion are, that, as already shown, would not change anybody's mind, and every teacher of the Bible would give his teaching the bias of his own conception of truth. It could not be otherwise.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.1*

4. To obviate this, it is evident that, the principles of the Christian religion having been settled by the council of the churches, the State would have to embody them in a text-book, which all would be required to use. Mr. Blair has already seen the necessity for this, and has planned for it, as appears from the following extract from a letter which he wrote to the secretary of the National Reform Association:—*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.2*

“I believe that a text-book of instruction in the principles of virtue, morality, and of the Christian religion, can be prepared for use in the pubic schools by the joint effort of those who represent every branch of the Christian church, both Protestant and Catholic.”*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.3*

First, of giving the Catholic Church the controlling voice in determing what religious instruction should be given in the public schools, so that very many, if not the majority, of the public schools

would virtually be only Roman Catholic parochial schools. Second, it would necessarily result in withholding the Bible from the people. For even though the principles laid down in the text-books or catechisms were in harmony with the Bible, it would not do to let the teachers have free access to the Bible, or else they would be imbibing doctrines that would be heretical, according to the religion of the State, and would be teaching them to the children. Within four hundred years men have been burned at the stake for doing just such things as that, and punishment of some kind would certainly follow in this country.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.4*

So we see that from whatever side we approach this amendment, it provides only for a union of Church and State, and that union on the Catholic model. We have not indulged in any fanciful speculation. History repeats itself; because human nature is ever the same. The reason which led to the prohibiting of the Bible in the Middle Ages, will do the same thing now.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.5*

One other point in Senator Blair's remarks should be noticed. That is, that it is of the greatest importance that a child should possess a knowledge of the principles of the Christian religion, even if he does not apply those principles in his personal conduct. We most heartily dissent. We don't believe that the knowledge which Judas had of the principles of the Christian religion, and he must have had an intimate knowledge of them, made his traitorous act one whit better. The principles of the Christian religion are of no account whatever unless they are applied to the personal conduct. Indeed they are worse than useless if not applied to the personal conduct, since they make the individual satisfied with a mere form of religion. And so again we charge this amendment with providing for a State religion which will be utterly destitute of the power of vital godliness, and of planning the education of children in this form, so that they will become conceited formalists, sunk in carnal security.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.6*

If anybody says that there is no danger that the amendment will ever be adopted, we warn him against indulging in any such delusion. The National Reform Association is to a man in favor of it. *The Christian Statesman*, of said:—*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.7*

“Senator Blair’s proposed amendment furnishes an admirable opportunity for making the ideas of the National Reform Association familiar to the mind of the people.”*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.8*

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 6, 1888, Mr. John Alexander, the father and first president of the National Reform Association, congratulated the association on the introduction of the Blair amendment, and said: “The National Reform Association ought to spare no pains and omit no effort which may promise to secure its adoption.” And in the issue of December 27, 1888, the same paper spoke most enthusiastically of both of Mr. Blair’s religious bills, and said: “Both of these measures involve the principle of National Christianity,” thus showing that we are not taking a partisan view when we say that its adoption will make the union of Church and State.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.9*

The National Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, at its annual convention in New York in October, 1888, formally indorsed the Educational Amendment bill. See the report of Resolution Committee, in *Daily Union Signal*, October 24, 1888.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 66.10*

Besides this, the American Sunday Union, which was organized to push the Sunday-Rest bill and similar measures, is in favor of it. In fact, where the Sunday-Rest bill would find one supporter, the Educational Amendment bill would probably find a dozen; because so many are carried away by the glittering promises in the last part of section two, that they cannot see the danger in the other part. While plucking the rose, they will be stung by the serpent, unless they are warned. Will not the reader of this join us in sounding the alarm?*AMS March 20, 1889, page 67.1*

E. J. W.

**“The State to Enforce Church Discipline” American Sentinel 4, 9.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *National Presbyterian*, January, 1889, in an editorial entitled, “The Church and the Sunday Newspaper,” said:—*AMS March 20,*

1889, page 68.1

“The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper, is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is with the church.”*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.2*

Similar statements are very often made. That the churches are the greatest Sunday breakers is quite generally admitted. It is a fact that the first Sunday excursion train was run at the request of ministers and church people. In *Our Day*, January, 1889, there is an article by Prof. W. G. Ballantine, of Oberlin, Ohio, which is wholly devoted to a statement of how members of churches in the East disregard the Sunday when they are on pleasure excursions in the West. In that he makes it apparent that professed Sunday-keeping Christians are responsible for a large part of the business that is done on Sunday. He says:—*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.3*

“There can never be a Sabbath in Colorado until Eastern Christians have more conscience. They give the lie, when they go there, to the teachings of the home missionaries whom they support there.”*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.4*

These testimonies might be duplicated many times over, but they are sufficient for the purpose of our argument. Read them again carefully before you go further. Mark well the statement of the *National Presbyterian*, that the Sunday newspaper, which is regarded as a synonym for the rankest kind of Sunday desecration, “is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers.”*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.5*

It is to stop just such things as this that Sunday laws are wanted. Everybody knows that whenever a speech is made urging the necessity for a Sunday law, the Sunday excursion and the Sunday newspaper are set forth as equal to the saloon in desecrating the

day. Now take particular note of this point:—*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.6*

1. Since, by the admission of the representatives of the churches, it is church members who are responsible for the greater part of the Sunday desecration, it is evident that if church members kept Sunday strictly, the amount of Sunday business and pleasure would be reduced to a minimum. 2. Since these church members do by the very act of becoming church members pledge them-selves to observe Sunday as a rest day, it is evident that in violating Sunday they are violating a rule of the church, and are proper subjects for church discipline. The *National Presbyterian* makes this very emphatic. 3. Therefore it is evident, further, that when these churches call for State and National laws to enforce Sunday observance, they are simply asking the civil power to enforce the rules of the church, and to execute church discipline.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.7*

Let the reader judge if this is not a legitimate conclusion. We know that it cannot be fairly disputed. And therefore the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws does mark the consummation of the union of Church and State. No different state of things from this ever existed in the middle ages. The church then declared who were heretical, and the civil power executed the penalty upon them. That is what the American Sunday Union is asking to-day, that the Government shall enforce one of the laws of the church. And so by the evidence which they themselves furnish, they are working to secure an exact re-production of the Papacy. No wonder they find Cardinal Gibbons willing to co-operate with them.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.8*

But they will say that many States have Sunday laws and have had them for a long time, and yet there have been no such terrible results as would naturally follow a union of Church and State. To this we reply: (1) That these laws have been largely inoperative. It is this very fact which makes the American Sunday Union call for a National Sunday law. They want a National law to give efficiency to the State laws. Therefore it is not to be expected that we should have seen the full effect of Sunday laws. (2) But even with the manifest disadvantage which the Union claims, of having no

National law to give force to the State laws, we have seen such results from Sunday laws in some States, notably in Arkansas and Tennessee, that we have no desire to see the union of Church and State made any more complete. If State Sunday laws can get in such deadly work now, what would they not do with a National law back of them to make them “efficient”? We leave the reader to solve the problem. E. J. W.*AMS March 20, 1889, page 68.9*



## March 27, 1889

“Civil Sunday and Civil Lent” *American Sentinel* 4, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

A few weeks ago we received from a friend a long communication received by him from a friend who is a prominent and active member of the Prohibition party in Ohio. The letter was a defense of the Prohibition party against the charge of desiring religious legislation, but as it would fill about four pages of the *AMERICAN SENTINEL*, we were forced to decline it. One paragraph, however, we preserved, and present it herewith:—*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.1*

“Nowhere has or does the Prohibition party ask that the Sabbath be preserved as a religious institution, but, on the contrary, asks it on purely civil grounds, and for purely civil reasons.”*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.2*

We are not disposed to deny that statement, and we are not aware that we have ever said anything to the contrary. It is admitted that the Prohibition party has asked for legislation in behalf of “the Sabbath,” and that is enough. We care not on what grounds such legislation is asked for; we have no more objection to Sunday legislation upon avowedly religious grounds than we have for Sunday legislation upon professedly civil grounds. Sunday legislation is Sunday legislation, no matter what reason is given for it. It can have but one effect, whether asked for in the interest of religion, of temperance, of the workingman, as a “police regulation,” or as a purely “sanitary arrangement,” for the cure of corns or some other of the numerous ills that flesh is heir to.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.3*

We have no doubt that very many people are sincere in their appeal for “civil Sunday laws.” They believe that religious legislation is a bad thing, and, without stopping to reason, they imagine that if they can only change the name, the evils will all vanish. Sunday is purely an institution of the church, and Sunday legislation cannot be anything else but religious legislation. This becomes specially

apparent when its advocates talk about preserving “the Sabbath.” It makes no difference what day of the week men have in mind when they speak of the Sabbath, the fact is that “the Sabbath” is a religious institution. If its observance is enforced by civil law, that will not deprive it of its ecclesiastical character. If Sunday observance is enjoined for purely civil reasons, then we shall have religious legislation for civil reasons. Now it is not the reasons for the legislation that we object to, but the fact of the legislation.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.4*

The people who are active in the support of Sunday laws “for purely civil reasons,” have a great deal to say about the kind of men who are elected to official positions in the State. They say that an immoral, licentious man should not be elected to public office. But the friends of these immoral men might say, We do not want to put them in office on the basis of their private moral characters, but solely on intellectual grounds; he may be an immoral man, but we are electing him only in his civil and not in his moral aspect. Would the National Reformers accept any such reasoning? Not by any means. They would say that an immoral man would still be an immoral man, no matter on what grounds he was placed in office. Why is it that they cannot or will not see that the name that may be given to Sunday legislation does not change its character.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.5*

The State might as well, command the observance of Lent as to command the observance of Sunday. Both are institutions of the church, and both might be enforced from “purely civil grounds.” Certainly considerations of health demand that six weeks of the year should be spent in a mild mortification of the flesh. Thousands of people would have no intermission in their round of gaiety if it were not for the halt which Lent calls; yet there are other thousands who pay no attention to Lent, and who keep all sorts of amusements going, much to the discomfort of those who see them, and yet are deprived by the customs of their church from joining in them.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.6*

But when it comes to the interest of the workingman, then Lent is a long ways ahead of Sunday. Our National Reformers who have the good of the workingman so much at heart, have been neglectful of

their opportunities, or they would have know that Lent was perpetuated solely in the interest of working people. Read the following from “The Puritans and Queen Elizabeth,” by Dr. Samuel Hopkins (Gould and Lincoln, 1860), Vol. 2, pp. 73-75:—*AMS March 27, 1889, page 73.7*

“A remarkable English reason for observing fast-days, and particularly the Lent Fast, is forced upon our notice by an order of the Council to the Archbishop on the thirteenth day of December.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.1*

“It was a matter of State policy-and wise, being insular policy-that ‘the numbers of cattle should be increased, and that the abundance of fish which the sea yieldeth should be generally received. Besides, there should be great consideration had for the preservation of a navy and maintenance of convenient numbers of sea-faring men, both which would otherwise decay, if some means were not found whereby they might be increased.’ King Edward VI. and his Council were of this mind. By proclamation January 16, 1547-48, ‘the king allowed that men should on fast-days abstain from food of flesh to subdue the body unto the soul and spirit. And also for worldly and civil policy, to spare flesh and use fish for the benefits of the commonwealth where many be fishers, ... and that the nourishment of the land might be increased by saving flesh, and especially at the spring-time when Lent doth commonly fall, and when the most common and plenteous breeding of flesh is, ... and that divers of the king’s subjects have good livings and riches in uttering and selling such meat as the sea and waters do minister unto us.’ These reasons were so highly appreciated that the Parliament, which met in the next November, enacted a law for observing fasting-days, which contains the very reasons given in this proclamation.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.2*

“But the Puritan aversion to everything which savored of superstition and of slavery to Rome, had turned against ceremonial, periodical fastings; and thus the fish-days of the church had fallen into general disrepute and desuetude. The fishermen found their occupation on the wane, and prayed to the Council for help.*AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.3*

“The Council, therefore, interfered; and, in terms unusually clear, set forth their reasons. Addressing a letter to the Archbishop, they wrote: ‘The laws for the observance of Embring and Fifty Days are not so duly observed as they ought to be, and as is requisite in policy for the maintenance of mariners, fishermen, and the navy of the realm. Her Highness hath therefore given strait charge unto her own household for the observance of those days; and also, to the Lord Mayor of the City of London and other of her Majesty’s officers and loving subjects abroad, to the intent... the State might take such benefit by the laws as was at the time of making intended. Which, we can assure your Lordship is *the only cause* why at this time the observation of the days is so much urged... We have thought good to require your Lordship to give order within your province, that the ministers and preachers be commanded in their sermons to the people to instruct them to conform themselves and their families to the said laws; and further to declare unto them, that the same is not required for any liking of Popish ceremonies heretofore used (which are utterly detested), *but only to maintain the mariners and navy in this land, by setting men a fishing.*”AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.4

If our Catholic and Episcopal friends wish to enforce the observance of Lent, there is an abundance of ground on which they can do so, aside from its ecclesiastical character. What does it matter if it did originate with the church? People generally eat too much anyway, and it would be for the benefit of their health if they would fast a little. So let our Sunday-law friends be consistent, and while they legislate in behalf of the workingman, let them not forget Lent.AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.5

E. J. W.AMS March 27, 1889, page 74.6

**April 3, 1889**

**“Questions of the Blair Bills” American Sentinel 4, 11.**

E. J. Waggoner

EDITOR SENTINEL: I understand that you take the position the Senator Blair’s Educational bill is in reality a bill for the “establishment of a national religion.” *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.1*

But I understand that the claim has been made, and on good authority, that the bill was introduced for the primary purpose of preventing a condition of things threatened by the recent at-tempt of the Catholics to gain control of the public schools of Boston and vicinity. *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.2*

Do you not think that the lack of educational facilities in some States of the South had also much to do with the proposed legislation on that question? *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.3*

Do not the prohibitions relative to institutions, corporations, or persons giving instruction or training “in the doctrines, tenents, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society, being or claiming to be religious in its character,” prevent the possibility of the bill under consideration ever favoring the Catholic Church in teaching their peculiar doctrines in the public schools? *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.4*

With such provisions incorporated into the United States Constitution, could not our general Government prevent under all circumstances the promulgation of Catholic views in communities where the Catholics were in the majority, as in California? *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.5*

Do you not think that section 1 of the Educational bill will aid in carrying out the spirit of the first amendment to the United States Constitution? *AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.6*

Would not your objection to the bill be removed if the expression, “the principles of the Christian religion,” in section 2, were

omitted?*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.7*

In your quotation from the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, in the article, "Provisions of the Sunday-Rest Bill," in the SENTINEL of February 20, do you not make two omissions of a very important part of the bill, viz., "to the disturbance of others"? Are not your arguments on the "absolute" requirements of the law for the Territories, based on such omissions? When you represent the bill as "obliging everybody to rest on Sunday" in the Territories, do you not convey an incorrect idea of its requirements?*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.8*

I notice the bill is given in full in the report of the hearing of the Sunday-Rest bill. A large number of the reports have been printed by order of the Senate, and the readers of the SENTINEL in the several States can be supplied by addressing their respective senators. A full account of all that was said and done on the occasion of the hearing is given. The report is official and worthy of consideration by all candid investigators.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.9*

Yours truly, L. T. NICOLA.

To these questions we reply as follows: We have taught that the Blair Educational Amendment should properly be entitled, "An amendment providing for the establishment of a national religion," and we teach so still. The correctness of this teaching has been demonstrated by plain arguments.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.10*

We should be pleased to have our friend cite the "good authority" for the claim that the amendment is for the purpose of preventing the Catholics from getting control of the schools. But that is immaterial. It is of very little importance why the amendment was proposed; all that concerns us is the effect that it would have if it should ever become a part of the Constitution, and that we can ascertain from the wording of it, regardless of any claim that may be made for it. It has been demonstrated that the practical effect of the amendment would be to give the Roman Catholics virtual control of the public schools in many States, and, in fact, in the whole country. Thus:—*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.11*

The second section provides that none of the doctrines, tenets,

observances, etc., peculiar to any sect shall ever be taught in the public schools. But at the same time it stipulates that the principles of the Christian religion shall be taught. Now there are some things that one denomination regards as vital principles of the Christian religion, that other sects ignore; the teaching of these the proposed amendment prohibits. It is obvious, therefore, that only those principles are contemplated which are common to all; and what these are can be determined only by a general church congress. But in such a congress the Roman Catholics, being stronger than any other sect,. would hold the balance of power, and with their long experience in political wire pulling would have but little difficulty in running the convention to suit themselves. But even after such a convention each State would attend to its own educational affairs, and in those States where the Roman Catholics are in a majority, they would teach their religion.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.12*

But our friend misapprehends the position of the AMERICAN SENTINEL if he thinks that our opposition to the proposed amendment is solely on the ground that it may throw the schools into the hands of the Roman Catholics. We are utterly opposed to the Government's teaching religion of any kind whatever, or to any degree. If the Catholics were barred out entirely, and no principles were to be taught except those which are held in common by the Protestant sects, we should be as much opposed to it as we are now, or as we would be if it, proposed to give the Catholics sole control. We go farther, and say that we should oppose the amendment even if it provided that each State should see that its schools taught only the religious principles we hold to be vital. Our conception of the gospel is something entirely different from what that would be. We cannot imagine that the Saviour, who would not remain in a country when its inhabitants requested him to leave, would take pleasure in seeing his gospel forced upon people who reject it in their hearts. Nothing could so surely bring the gospel of Christ into disrepute as the teaching of it to all, by the State. People who might be reached by persuasion, would be repelled by force.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 83.13*

The lack of educational facilities in the South had nothing to do with the proposed amendment. The Blair Educational bill, which has already passed the Senate, and which provides for the distribution

of \$77,000,000 among the States, doubtless had that in view; but even that, if it should pass both Houses of Congress, would never be any help to the South. If that should pass, and the amendment should be adopted, the National Reform people would simply have \$77,000,000 at their disposal with which to teach religion in the public schools.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.1*

Section 1 of the Educational Amendment is nullified by section 2. The first section says that no State shall make any law respecting an establishment of religion, and section 2 demands that each State shall set itself to teach religion. The State doesn't need to make a law respecting an establishment of religion, when it is itself an establishment of religion-a machine for teaching it. If the amendment prohibited the teaching of any form of religion in the public schools, leaving all denominations free as they are now, to teach at their own expense whatever doctrines they choose to, we certainly should have no objection to it. But if the clause relative to the teaching of "virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion," were omitted from the proposed amendment, there would be nothing left. Senator Blair made his principal plea before the senate on that clause. He seemed to regard that as the main feature of the whole thing.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.2*

Now as to the Sunday-Rest bill. That bill has been printed in the SENTINEL no less than four times, so that it is not our fault if every reader of the SENTINEL does not understand it. We commented on the bill as it is, and also on the bill as the National Sunday Union wish to have it modified. There is no doubt that if the bill should pass it would be amended according to their wishes, since it is their bill. For our part, it makes no difference which form is adopted. The original form says that no work shall be done on Sunday "to the disturbance of others." But it would astonish one who has had no experience, to see how easily some people can be disturbed on Sunday. The reports of the Sunday-law cases in Arkansas show that nearly every man who was prosecuted for working on Sunday was working in so retired a place, and so quietly, that nobody could have found it out without taking special pains; yet people were greatly "disturbed" by it. We have seen people very much "disturbed" because they knew that some other people were working at a noiseless occupation in the privacy of their own rooms.



A law providing for the punishment of anyone who does any work on Sunday “to the disturbance of others,” would open the flood-gates of religious bigotry and persecution. As to the amended bill, which provides that no work shall be done on Sunday “in public,” nothing more need be said.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.3*

We did not incorrectly represent the bill when we represented it as “obliging everybody to rest on Sunday,” as the bill itself will show. The bill, as drafted by Senator Blair, says that “no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business” on the first day of the week. We should be pleased to have our friend, or anyone else, name some people that are not included in those terms. If the bill is not “absolute” in its requirements for rest, to the full extent of its jurisdiction, we do not know how language could be framed to make it any more so.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.4*

We sincerely hope that “all candid investigators” have the report of the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill. If they have been hitherto in favor of the bill, the reckless determination on the part of the workers for the bill, to gain their ends, no matter at what cost to others, and the false and contradictory position taken, will suffice to convince them that the whole thing is an iniquitous scheme.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.5*

We are not infallible; and are as liable as others to make mistakes; but if we may always be as correctly represented as the Blair Sunday-Rest bill and its advocates have been in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we shall be satisfied.*AMS April 3, 1889, page 84.6*

E. J. W.

**April 10, 1889**

**“Sunday Laws and Temperance” American Sentinel 4, 12.**

E. J. Waggoner

By the above heading we do not mean to imply that Sunday laws and temperance have anything in common, or that they have any connection, for they do not. We have had some sharp discussions with friends that thought we ought not to pronounce wholesale condemnation on Sunday laws, but ought to work for, or at least not antagonize, laws prohibiting the selling of liquor on Sunday. But the more we see of the Sunday-law argument, the more convinced we are that no more vicious law could be passed than a so-called temperance Sunday law. All such laws are designed solely to exalt the Sunday above other days, but they do also exalt the liquor traffic to a place of respectability. We have lately come across a little tract on the subject, which shows this more plainly than anything we have ever before seen.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.1*

The tract in question is entitled, “Through the Side Door.” It is published by the “New York Sabbath Committee,” and purports to have been written by a working-woman. At the top of the first page of the tract, the following statement appears: “This paper received the prize of fifty dollars for the best essay on Sunday Liquor Selling, by a working man or woman.” This shows that the argument is considered an extra good one.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.2*

As a matter of fact, and as might be expected, the tract contains no argument whatever. It is simply a story, whether of real or fictitious occurrences is not stated. The lady represents herself as having been employed in a library just across the street from a saloon, where she could see all that went on. Moreover, the bartender was a patron of the library, and with him she had frequent talks. In the first conversation the young man told how he was forced, by lack of employment, to engage in the saloon business. After stating that he was obliged to tend bar or starve, the following dialogue occurred: —*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.3*

“*Working-woman*—Could not these same arguments be used just

as well by a man who, from being out of money, had taken to house breaking or highway robbery?*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.4*

*“Bartender—Perhaps they might, and most men would feel justified in doing either of those things rather than starve. But you must remember that those avocations are not lawful businesses, as ours is.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.5

*Working-woman—Except when you sell on Sunday.”AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.6*

There you have it. In this tract, issued for the purpose of arousing public sentiment in favor of Sunday laws, and against the saloon, the liquor traffic is plainly declared to be lawful and right on any day but Sunday.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.7*

But this is not all. After describing the building owned by Mr. Rorkle, for whom the young man tended bar, and speaking of the side door, she says:—*AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.8*

*“Now we knew, and all the neighbors knew, that despite the law, many customers of the bar-room came through this door every Sunday, and procured drinks just as easily as upon any other day. Men went into the door with natural complexion and demeanor, and came out flushed and excited; they went in with sedate expression and firm step, and came out with dazed and vacant look and unsteady limbs. We and the other neighbors all were perfectly cognizant of how the laws of the land (and higher laws beside) were violated every Sunday, over at that corner, and yet none of us liked to become an informer.”AMS April 10, 1889, page 91.9*

There it is again. Of course it is understood that there was a law against selling liquor on Sunday, and none against selling it on other days of the week, but we challenge anybody to show that the whole tenor of that paragraph does not go to support the idea that it is the day that makes the business wrong. Doubtless she and her neighbors saw the same scenes enacted every day, if they looked for them on any other day; they must have seen men go in sober and come out intoxicated and silly; but it didn't disturb them on any day but Sunday. The tract makes mention of Mr. Rorkle, telling what a fine, law-abiding man he was, and only one fault is recorded

against him, namely, that he kept open his saloon on Sunday.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 92.1*

We have no apology to offer for liquor selling. We believe that liquor is the cause of an untold amount of crime, and that it results in nothing but evil. But to say that it is worse to sell liquor on Sunday than on other days is the same as saying that it is worse to kill a man on Sunday than on any other day in the week. We take no stock in Sunday liquor laws, because we know that they do not help the cause of temperance a particle. On the contrary, they hinder it, by elevating the liquor traffic to a level with all other employments. Moreover, from what we have seen of the working of such laws, and from the arguments that are adduced in favor of them, we know that if strict Sunday laws were once secured, that would practically put an end to all temperance legislation. No general effort would ever be made to close saloons on other days. And so we say that the profession that Sunday liquor laws are temperance laws is the result either of ignorance or hypocrisy.*AMS April 10, 1889, page 92.2*

E. J. W.

## April 17, 1889

**“Is This ‘the Breath of the Puritan’?” American Sentinel 4, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Western Christian Union* is the name of a paper that is published weekly in the city of Oakland. We are thus explicit because, from what we shall quote from it, some might think that it is published in some remote portion of the world, where Christianity has not yet penetrated. Not only is it published in “the Athens of the Pacific Coast,” but its editor is the Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., pastor of the Second Congregationalist Church of Oakland. In his issue of March 22 the editor has a diatribe against the Adventists for the work which they did in securing signatures to the petitions against religious legislation by Congress, though we cannot see why he should level all his guns at the Adventists, since men of every denomination and profession signed that petition, and worked for it. *AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.1*

After saying that if the Blair Sunday-Rest bill should become a law, “it will be the formulated sentiments of nine-tenths of all the evangelical churches of the country,” thus admitting that it is wholly a religious bill, he proceeds thus:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.2*

“Against these majorities, constituted as they are, why are our Adventist friends continuously protesting? We are weary of Ishmaelitism in theology and upon questions of public morals. The methods employed in securing many of the 31,000 names of alleged citizens of California, recently presented in Congress, were not creditable to any people calling themselves religious. We refer to their practice of button-holing unsuspecting citizens in the railroad waiting-rooms, and on the street corners—not a few of whom were wholly unfamiliar with the question, and of inducing them to sign a narrow, sectarian protest, under the specious plea that the Constitution of the United States was threatened. We had entertained a high opinion of this people until we were forced to observe how they secured signatures to their recent petition.” *AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.3*

Well, we are glad that he bears testimony to the fact that people were button-holed before they signed the petition against religious legislation. He has been forced to observe the methods employed by those who canvassed for signatures. He is sure that they actually got near enough to the men whose names appear on it to button-hole them. And over 31,000-about 10,000 more-have been thus approached. Yet Mr. Bothwell is not pleased. Indeed, he feels very much grieved over the course taken. Why? Was, it because he thinks the canvassers were too painstaking? No; he is grieved and indignant and angry to think that the canvassers should actually button-hole unsuspecting persons, and ask them to sign the petition. Doubtless he would have had them send a postal card to every person a week beforehand, informing them that on such a day they would be pleased to meet them to confer about the propriety of asking Congress not to pass a law enforcing religious observances. Then, no doubt, he would have had a crier precede each canvasser, and announce his mission, so that no "unsuspecting citizens" could possibly be approached.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.4*

But if he would have had all this precaution taken in securing signatures; if he feels so indignant at the thought that men were actually button-holed without previous warning, who can picture what his feelings must be at the thought that of the 14,437,744 alleged petitioners for a national Sunday law, only 407 had any opportunity to be button-holed about it? It has been some time since we exposed the iniquitous scheme by which the friends of the Blair Sunday bill sought to make Congress believe that public sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of their measure, therefore we show it up again in another part of this paper, with a few points that were not previously noticed. Please turn and read that before you read further, and think that a man who has no word of condemnation or apology for such a course, says that it was disreputable to go to men in person and ask them to read the petition and sign it. What is the ground of his objection? Simply this, that so many *bona fide* signatures have been obtained to the protest. As what follows will show, he thinks it outrageous that any should dare protest against being ruled by a few self-constituted religious leaders.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.5*

Passing by more of the same unto quid sort we come to the following, which carries with it far more than the breath of the Puritan; it is the breath of the Inquisition:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.6*

“Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose, but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them, but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them may result.”*AMS April 17, 1889, page 97.7*

Shades of Dominic! Did anyone ever hear of more cool assumption? “Upon what meat cloth this our Cæsar feed, that he has grown so great?” Seventh-day people “can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose, but there let their privileges end.” If they are not thankful for these “concessions,” and if they work against “the purposes of their benefactors,” they may call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that “legislation embarrassing to them may result.” Now what does this mean? Simply this: That these Sunday-law people are beginning to assume that the Lord created the earth for their especial benefit, and that it is a great “concession” on their part for them to allow anybody even to think differently from them. Those who do not do as they do ought to be thankful that they are privileged to live in this country. They are the “benefactors” of Seventh-day people, because they have tolerated them so long. Did the Papacy in its worst days ever assume any more lordly position?*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.1*

It means further that if Seventh-day people will keep perfectly quiet, and be content with the privilege of resting on Saturday, they will not be molested. But let them, as Mr. Edwards said, begin to “rave;” that is, let them but teach their conscientious convictions to others, and then “legislation embarrassing to them may result.” This can

mean nothing else than that, whereas Seventh-day people are allowed, by existing and pro-posed Sunday laws, to rest on Saturday if they choose, they will be prohibited from doing even this if they rebel against their “benefactors,” and refuse to rest also on Sunday, and if they attempt to stir up others to similar rebellion. This is a declaration of intention on the part of the Sunday-law agitators a little in advance of anything we have previously heard.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.2*

Mr. Bothwell says of Seventh-day people that “none of these [Sunday] bills are aimed at them.” We cannot say definitely as to that, but we know where they always hit. We know that Sunday laws, whatever the purpose for which they are enacted, are always used for the purpose of “embarrassing” those who observe the seventh day of the week.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.3*

In 1885, Arkansas had Sunday laws reading as follows:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.4*

“SECTION 1883. Every person who shall on the Sabbath, or Sunday, be found laboring, or shall compel his apprentice or servant to labor or perform service other than customary household duties of daily necessity, comfort, or charity, on conviction thereof shall be fined one dollar for each separate offense.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.5*

“SEC. 1884. Every apprentice or servant compelled to labor on Sunday shall be deemed a separate offense of the master.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.6*

“SEC. 1885. The provision of this act shall not apply to steamboats and other vessels navigating the waters of the State, nor such manufacturing establishments as require to be kept in continual operation.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.7*

“SEC. 1886. Persons who are members of any religious society who observe as Sabbath any other day of the week than the Christian Sabbath, or Sunday, shall not be subject to the penalties of this act [the Sunday law], so that they observe one day in seven, agreeable to the faith and practice of their church or society.”*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.8*



In the session of the Arkansas Legislature of 1885, section 1886 was repealed, by act of March 3. The object of those who secured the repeal of that section was, as they said, to close the saloons. It was claimed that, under cover of that section, certain Jews who kept saloons in Little Rock had successfully defied the law against Sunday saloons, and that there was no way to secure the proper enforcement of the law without the repeal of that section. The legislators believed the statements made, and repealed the section as stated.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.9*

“Bear in mind that the object of this movement was said to be to close the saloons on Sunday; and what discussion there was on the bill in both the Senate and the House, shows that such was the object, so far as the legislators understood it. But when the act was secured, and was framed into a law, not a saloon was closed, nor was there an attempt made, any more than before, to close them. Not one of the saloon keepers was prosecuted. And in Little Rock itself, during the session of the Legislature of 1887, when the law was in full force, up to the time of the restoration of the exemption clause, the saloons kept their doors wide open, and conducted their business with no effort at concealment, the same as they had before the act was passed. But, so far as we have been able to learn by diligent investigation, from the day of its passage, the law was used for no other purpose than to punish peaceable citizens of the State who observed the seventh day as the Sabbath, and exercised their God-given right to work on Sunday.”*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.10*

A. T. Jones, of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, who makes the above statement, has had the privilege of investigating the records of the cases of those who were prosecuted under the law as amended, and has published them in his pamphlet, “Civil Government and Religion.” In another article, entitled, “Where Sunday Laws Hit,” in this week’s issue, we shall present some of those cases, that our readers may learn the practical workings of “temperance Sunday laws.” As they read these things we ask them to decide whether or not they want the Inquisition set up in this country. People may talk as much as they please about the enlightenment of this nineteenth century, and the impossibility for persecution to arise; but every can-did person whose eyes are open must see that we are upon

the very eve of as bitter a persecution as ever disgraced this earth. The minds of men are being inflamed by ecclesiastical leaders, and all that is needed is the color of law to give the malignant passions of bigots full exercise. E. J. W.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 98.11*

**“Whose Image and Superscription Is This?” American Sentinel 4, 13.**

E. J. Waggoner

It is evident that the leaders in the American Sabbath Union are considerably disturbed over the SENTINEL'S disclosure of their crooked methods in obtaining indorsements to their petitions to Congress. This is shown by the fact that they are endeavoring to shield themselves by insinuating that unfair methods were employed by those who secured signatures to the counter petition. It is worthy of note, however, and should be remembered by all, that the worst charge that has yet been brought by the most bigoted Sunday-law worker is that people were “button-holed” and asked to sign it. Inasmuch as no one could put his own signature to the petition unless the canvasser did come pretty close to him with it, we regard this as a good testimonial to the conscientiousness with which the work was performed.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.1*

We have before called attention to the frauds practiced by the active workers for a Sunday law, but we fear that some have lost sight of them. Many people still think that fourteen million signatures have actually been obtained to the petition asking Congress to make a Sunday law. We ourselves were deceived at the first into thinking that two or three million signatures had been obtained; but when the number jumped at once from six million to fourteen million, by the letter from Cardinal Gibbons, we knew there was fraud; and from that time we kept discovering fresh frauds. Following is a brief statement of them.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.2*

The petition for a Sunday law, to which it is claimed that upwards of fourteen million signatures have been obtained, reads thus:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.3*

“The undersigned, adult residents of the, United States, 21 years of

age or more, hereby earnestly petition your honorable body to pass a bill forbidding in the Nation's mail and military service, and in inter-State commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday work, traffic, etc.”*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.4*

That is plain enough to be understood by anybody. If that had been circulated in a legitimate manner, for individual signatures, no complaint could have been made. But right on the face of the sheet which contained the petition, provision was deliberately made for fraud. Immediately below the petition was the following note:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.5*

*“When a labor organization or church, or any other society, indorses the petition BY VOTE, let the ‘name’ of the organization be signed, with the attesting signatures of the presiding officer and clerk or secretary, with place and date, and in the margin, under ‘number of petitioners,’ indicate the numbers in the organization petitioning.”AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.6*

This meant that at any meeting of any church or society, a vote could be taken on the petition. If a majority of the members present voted in favor of it, the presiding officer and the clerk would sign their names and set down the number of members in the entire church or society. Now it must be evident to the most zealous partisan that such a plan could not by any possibility secure an individual expression of opinion. In the first place it allowed a part to speak for the whole.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.7*

Not only was this provision made for fraud, but people were urged to commit fraud by securing the indorsement of the same person twice. In the “Monthly Document” of the American Sabbath Union, for December, the following appeared in a circular which editors were requested to publish:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.8*

*“We ask every religious paper to publish our petition, and every church and preachers’ meeting and religious conference or convention to indorse the petition by resolution, and also, as far as possible, by individual signatures, which duplicate its strength.”AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.9*

That is plain enough, too. The leaders of the American Sabbath Union deliberately urged people to perpetrate fraud in securing indorsements of the Sunday-Rest bill. The above shows that the indorsement “by vote” was considered the chief thing. Whenever there was an assembly they wanted those present to vote the indorsement of the organization, so that all the members could be counted as favoring the petition, and then they wanted the strength of the petition duplicated, “as far as possible” by individual signatures. This shows that the securing of individual signatures was considered a secondary matter, except that those individual signatures would duplicate the strength of the petition. A church of three hundred members could indorse the petition by vote some Sunday evening, and the whole three hundred counted for it, even though no more than one hundred members were present. Then zealous workers could secure the individual signatures of two-thirds of the members, including those present at the time of the vote; and so from a church of three hundred members, of whom only one hundred had seen the petition, and only one hundred more had heard of it, a list of five hundred petitioners could be sent in. And just such fraud as this was provided for and urged by the leaders in the Sunday-law movement. The method of indorsement “by vote” was so much easier, however, that, as will be seen, very little effort was made to secure individual signatures.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.10*

On Wednesday, January 16, the first petitions were presented to Congress. After senators from several States, including Illinois, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and Indiana, had presented petitions from churches, labor unions, Woman’s Christian Temperance Unions, etc., from their respective States, Mr. Blair arose and said:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.11*

“I present petitions of several bodies, praying for the passage of a Sunday-Rest law. Of the petitions, the following analysis is submitted by those who desire their presentation:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.12*

*Petitions from national bodies:*

## CONTENTS

1. Individual signatures	407
2. Representative signatures by indorsements of bodies and meetings	14,174,337
Total	14,174,744

“Analysis of the latter:—

“First indorsement is that of the American Sabbath Union, which was officially constituted by official action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Home Missionary Society of the Baptist Church, the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church (North and South), and the Synod of the Reformed Church, five denominations, whose membership together is 5,977,693. Of the membership of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the indorsement of whose international convention stands second, at least 20,000 citizens of the United States. Of the Knights of Labor, the indorsement of whose international convention stands third, at least 219,000 citizens of the United States. The Presbyterian General Assembly, North, whose action stands next, had at the time of the indorsement 722,071 members. The convention of Christian Workers, whose indorsement is next, had 450 present when the unanimous vote of indorsement was taken. The Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, which comes next, had 185,521 at the time of the vote. The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000.”*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.13*

Now what do we learn from this? Several things, namely: That out of 14,174,744 alleged petitioners for the Sunday law, only 407 persons actually signed the petition. That in order to produce a greater effect, the petitions were presented first by States and Territories, and then in bulk. In that way the strength of the petitions, which had already been duplicated, was duplicated again.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.14*

But this is not all. We find that the entire membership of the Methodist, the Baptist, and the Presbyterian Churches in the United States is taken to help make up the 14,174,744 alleged petitioners. This was done because the annual convention of those bodies indorsed the petition. A vote by a few hundred people was thus

swelled into nearly seven million. Not only so, but by the wording of the petition, every member of those churches was certified to as being "21 years of age or more." Of course everybody recognizes that as another fraud.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.15*

Still further: The entire membership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Knights of Labor, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, is counted on the strength of a vote taken by a few members of those bodies, in convention assembled. Of course the members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union could, on general principles, be counted as favoring the bill; but as they are Christian women, they of course belong to some one of the churches previously reported. The same is true largely of the Knights of Labor and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Not only were they represented as favoring the bill, although but few of them had ever heard of it, and many were opposed, but they were represented three times, as we have already seen.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.16*

More yet: After this 14,000,000 and more petitioners, only 407 of whom ever petitioned, had been presented to Congress as organizations, then as churches, etc., Mr. Blair arose again and said:—*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.17*

"I have here a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Jersey, with 6,000 members; of Indiana, 2,500 members; of Massachusetts, 6,000; of Delaware, 800; of Illinois, 9,000; of Iowa, 6,000; of Pennsylvania, 6,000; of Dakota, 1,800, and the National nearly 20,000, praying Congress, etc."*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.18*

Just think! Petitions from many of these State temperance unions had been first presented by other senators. Then they were presented in the churches, then in the National Union, then again separately, and then once more in the National W. C. T. U. again; and after all this some more petitions were presented from Temperance Unions and "Sabbath Associations." Some of these good women were therefore presented as petitioners not less than six times in one day; and since then petitions have been presented from the same people nearly every day while the session

lasted.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.19*

But this is not all by any means. Mr. Blair said in his analysis of the petitions: "The Roman Catholics, for whom Cardinal Gibbons speaks, number 7,200,000." Cardinal Gibbons had written a letter to Mr. Crafts, personally favoring the Sunday bill, and on the strength of that letter, the American Sabbath Union counted 7,200,000 names. Not only that, but they certified that all the Catholics in the United States, men, women, and children-are "21 years of age or more." Not only did Cardinal Gibbons say nothing about indorsing the petition for anybody but himself, which he clearly had no right to do, but he himself, as will be seen by his letter, which follows declares that he had no thought of committing anybody else.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 99.20*

One thing more shows the unprincipled methods employed to manufacture a huge list in favor of the Sunday bill. Not content to have the separate labor organizations indorse it by "representation," that is, by a vote of a few, which could not represent the body, Mr. Crafts has lately gone to work to secure the indorsement of the Federated Trades, by which means he is able to count all the laboring men again. Thus he can count every man as many times as there are associations to which he belongs. Not only so, but by their peculiar scheme of representative indorsement, they count many who are positively opposed to their movement, and who have signed the counter petition.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 100.1*

Now we ask the readers of the SENTINEL to decide whose image and whose superscription this Sunday movement bears. Does it bear the stamp of God? God cannot lie. But there is another being, the enemy of God and of all righteousness, the prince of the power of the air, "the spirit which now worketh in the children of disobedience," whose sole method of work is by fraud and deceit. Of him it is written that "he is a liar, and the father of it." We make no further statements, but leave the reader to trace the parentage of the Sunday movement as best he can.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 100.2*

Let those who have been misrepresented by being counted in these wholesale indorsements, and those who have not been aware of

the character of the movement, protest vigorously, and at once, so that the leaders in the. Sunday-law movement may no longer be able to pose before Congress as the representatives of all goodness and honesty.*AMS April 17, 1889, page 100.3*

E. J. W.



**May 1, 1889**

**“Sunday Law and the Law of Nature” American Sentinel 4, 15.**

E. J. Waggoner

A gentleman in Kansas, who has been receiving the AMERICAN SENTINEL for some months, by the courtesy of a friend, writes to us that he does not indorse its teachings, and particularizes after the following fashion:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.1*

“It would be unwise to enter into detail, but I am amazed that Americans calling themselves intelligent should oppose so-called civil Sunday legislation, and, at the same time, favor legislation touching other propositions contained in the decalogue. ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ ‘Thou shalt not steal,’ ‘Thou shalt not bear false witness,’ etc., might as well be kicked against on religious grounds as, ‘Remember the Sabbath-day,’ etc.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.2*

“I have had personal occasion to know that a mule team can make a one-thousand-mile journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.3*

“I once asked a locomotive engineer which would be the best for the locomotive, all other things being equal, forty-two days’ work in six weeks, or forty-two days’ work in seven weeks? He replied, ‘The latter, by all means.’ Mules and locomotives cannot be accused of religious fanaticism.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.4*

“My conclusion is that a rest-day of one in seven is *inwrought into the nature of things*. You and I cannot change it. We may buck, and kick, and wax profane, but the great law of a necessary rest-day will still exist, and the higher the enlightenment the more the law will be recognized.”*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.5*

We quote this much of the letter because it is a fair sample of the understanding, or rather the misunderstanding, which Sunday-law advocates seem to have of our opposition to their work. Our correspondent well says that we are opposed to “so-called civil

Sunday legislation.” That is it, exactly. It is so-called civil Sunday legislation, but actually religious or ecclesiastical Sunday legislation. To show that this is so we make a few quotations.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.6*

In an article in the *California Prohibitionist*, of December 6, 1888, the Rev. N. R. Johnston, a prominent National Reformer, said:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.7*

“We do ask a law that will be in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment.”*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.8*

And again:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.9*

“We recommend most strenuous and prayerful efforts in the States and Territories to secure legislation in harmony with the fourth commandment.”*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.10*

In Mr. Crafts’s speech before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, at Indianapolis, November 16, 1888, he said:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.11*

“A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out.”*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.12*

The Rev. James Brand, D.D., in an article in the *Advance* of March 21, 1889, said:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.13*

“If there is no good moral principle behind the Sunday law it cannot stand.”*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.14*

And Colonel Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Association, in his address upon his election, said: “Every man, woman, and child in our country is going to be judged by the fourth commandment,” indicating, as Mr. Johnston said, that Sunday laws are designed to enforce the religious observance of the day.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.15*

Finally, as an admission of what we have always claimed, we quote from a sermon by Rev. Byron Sunderland, D. D., entitled, “The

Right to Sunday Laws,” published in the New York Evangelist, March 28, 1889. Speaking of the declaration made by Mr. Wolfe of the secular league, before the Senate Committee, that “he did not object to the civil Sunday, and would help to enforce it,” Mr. Sunderland says:—*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.16*

“No man can make such an admission and not go to the end with those who secure and retain a Christianity which is the rational observance of our American Sabbath in every particular. It is simply impossible to have a civil Sunday, that is, a day of rest from ordinary, occupation, and not exclude from it a voluntary religious observance. The declaration forcibly reminds one of a certain lord bishop who said, ‘Oh, but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a man.’ ‘That is true, your grace,’ replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the man what will become of the bishop who said, ‘Oh but you know, John, I do not swear as a bishop, only as a man.’ ‘That is true, your grace,’ replied the valet, but I was thinking when the devil comes for the *man* what will become of the *bishop*?” *AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.17*

These statements, from among many that might be quoted, show not only that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, but that it cannot by any possibility be anything else. *AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.18*

Concerning the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, which our correspondent quotes, we have this to say: First, that there is a universally recognized difference between the first four commandments and the last six. The first four relate only to man’s duty to God, but the last six present his duty to his fellow-men. With man’s duty to God no man has any right to interfere, but Governments exist for the sole purpose of preserving the proper relation of citizens to one another. Second, legislation concerning killing and stealing and bearing false witness is not legislation upon the sixth, eighth, and ninth commandments, and does not derive its authority from those commandments. The Government punishes the murderer, not because the commandment says it is wrong to kill, but because the murderer interferes with the right to life and liberty which the Government grants to all citizens. This is shown further by the fact that, when the Government punishes the

murderer, it does not execute one particle of the penalty for breaking the sixth commandment. The punishment which civil government metes out to the murderer does not make his guilt any the less, or leave him any the less to answer for before the bar of God. It is simply a pledge on the part of the Government that the people shall be protected in future from his lawlessness.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 113.19*

We might call attention, while passing, to the fact that Sunday legislation has nothing whatever to do with the fourth commandment, even though it were proper and possible for Government to legislate concerning the decalogue. A man will search in vain for any reference to Sunday in the fourth commandment. A law in accordance with the divine law of the fourth commandment, such as Mr. Johnston wants, would enforce the observance of the seventh day, or Saturday; but, although this day is enjoined by the commandment, civil government has no right to enforce its observance.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.1*

Our correspondent says that “a mule team can make a thousand miles’ journey at the rate of six days per week, and come out at the end in less time and in better condition than when worked seven days per week.” We do not question that at all, but we claim that it affords no reason for Sunday legislation. Granting that man and beast could do more work if they rest one day in seven, what is there in that to indicate that that day should be Sunday? and what right has the Government to specify on which day they shall take their needed rest? We are not, as he imagines, “kicking against a rest-day.” We not only believe in the right of every man to rest one day in seven if he chooses to, but we also believe that it is the duty of every man to rest one day in seven, even on the day which the fourth commandment enjoins; but we do not recognize the right of Government to say that a man shall do his duty in regard to the fourth commandment, any more than it may compel him to obey the first, and worship God.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.2*

Then again there is a difference of opinion among men as to what day is enjoined by the fourth commandment; and Government has no more right to decide the question between them than it has to interfere with men’s honest difference concerning the age of the

earth or the mode of baptism. Every man has reason, and one man cannot think for another, neither can the Government take it upon itself to do the thinking for all its citizens.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.3*

In line with the statement that “mules will do more work if allowed to rest one day in seven,” is the statement that “a rest-day of one in seven is inwrought in the nature of things;” but that does not prove that the Government should compel men to comply with that law, neither does it indicate upon what day that periodical rest should be taken. If we are to fall back upon the law of nature, then we must let nature execute her own laws, or else we must legislate upon everything which the laws of nature demand.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.4*

We will take a parallel and see how it works. The necessity for bodily rest is inwrought in the very nature of man, and not only so, but nature has indicated when that rest should be taken, by making a regularly recurring period of darkness, in which sleep is natural, and work is most difficult. Now, if the State may legislate concerning a weekly rest, surely there is more reason why it should legislate concerning a daily rest, because the daily rest is more necessary to one's physical well-being than is the weekly rest, and nature indicates when the daily rest should be taken, but indicates nothing concerning the time of the weekly rest. If the State may say that all men must rest upon Sunday because it is good to rest one day in seven, then it may likewise say that all men must take eight hours' sleep every night. And just as the State makes no difference even though a man may have rested one day in the week and is not tired when Sunday comes, so it must make no difference even though a man is not tired when the regularly appointed hour for retiring comes. Sunday-law makers say that those who observe another day than Sunday are a very small minority, and that they must submit even though they are inconvenienced and obliged to lose more time than others. They say that the liberty of rest for one depends upon the law of rest for all. Now we will apply that argument in another case.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.5*

The State, as we have seen, is under greater obligation to compel people to rest every day than to rest once a week, but when it

comes to enforcing this law, it finds some men who are employed upon a morning newspaper, and who are obliged to work in the night and to take their needed rest in the day-time. These would naturally protest against a law compelling everybody to go to bed at nine o'clock and stay there till five in the morning; but the advocates of the law may claim that the liberty of rest for each depends upon the law of rest for all, and that no discrimination can be made. The number of those who work upon morning newspapers is only a small proportion of the number of inhabitants of the country, and the convenience of the majority must be considered. We think, that anyone can see the injustice of this, and we know that the only reason why they cannot see the gross injustice of the same argument concerning Sunday is because of prejudice and religious bigotry.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.6*

Later on in his letter, our friend tells about people who have been "downed" in trying to reverse the nature of things; but, as we have shown, we are not trying to reverse the nature of things. We are not protesting against a weekly rest-day. All that we protest against is the assumption that, because some men want to take their rest on Sunday, everybody else must be compelled to do likewise. This is not in the nature of things only as it is man's nature to be selfish; and against such unreasonable selfishness as that everybody ought to protest. It is neither civil nor religious.*AMS May 1, 1889, page 114.7*

E. J. W.

**May 15, 1889**

**“Fitly Designated” American Sentinel 4, 16.**

E. J. Waggoner

The leading article in *Our Day* for April is an address by Rev. W. F. Crafts, at Mr. Cook’s Monday lecture, March 25, and is entitled, “A Strategic Year in Sabbath Reform.” This is a most appropriate heading for a summary of the work of the American Sabbath Union during the year 1888. It shows that Mr. Crafts appreciates the situation. A strategem is defined by Webster as “a trick by which some advantage is to be obtained. An artifice.” Strategic means, “pertaining to strategy, effected by artifice. Therefore, since, according to Mr. Crafts, the year 1888 has been a strategic year in the Sunday work, it has been a year of trickery and fraud.*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.1*

That this is indeed so must be evident to anyone who has read the SENTINEL’S exposure of the methods of Mr. Crafts and his associate Sunday reformers. They started out with deceit, and with exhortation to deceive, when they requested all public conventions to indorse the Sunday petition by vote, and then to duplicate the strength of the petition as far as possible by securing the individual signatures of the assembly. Then, by securing a few representative indorsements, they counted in whole denominations, thousands of members of which had never heard of the petition. A letter from Cardinal Gibbons stating simply that he personally favored the movement, was forthwith counted as the signatures of 7,200,000 Catholics. Not content with counting in the entire membership of the various religious organizations as well being twenty-one years of age or more, they went to Sunday-schools, and secured the names of the children to their petition, which stated that each signer is twenty-one years of age or more. Then, in order to swell their list of petitioners, they counted some of the religious denominations twice, then counted the Woman’s Christian Temmperance Unions as local organizations as State organizations, and again twice as a national organization, besides already having counted them in with the religious bodies. The same way with the Knights of Labor. They secured the votes of local assemblies, then by a vote of the general

assembly they counted in the entire organization, and then securing a favorable vote from the Counsel of Federated Trades they succeeded in counting the workingmen in again, although thousands of them are opposed to the Blair bills.*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.2*

Mr. Crafts went in person to the Assemblies of the Knights of Labor and pleaded with them to indorse his petition. Yet he claims that the petition was started to satisfy the clamor of the workingmen! Not content with these methods of making it appear that the great majority of the people of the country are calling for Sunday laws, they now garble the statements of those who are opposing the movement with all their might, and give it out that their opposition is really not opposition, but a plea for the law.*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.3*

Then again the Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his address on Sunday newspapers at the Washington Conference, in December, said, as quoted in the February number of *Our Day*:—*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.4*

“If we base the Sabbath on mere human expediency, we base it on sand, just as we would found honesty, if we adopted it simply as a policy. This is no basis for the Sabbath, to put it on the ground of mere expediency. I do not question the propriety of using this argument as a means of influencing a certain class of men. Many will join in this Sunday movement and work heartily in the defense of Sunday as a rest-day, in the interests of health and morals, and good citizenship, who will not come to the higher ground. But we can never permanently keep our Sabbath on the basis of expediency.”*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.5*

Here we find this man, a zealous advocate of Sunday laws, deliberately counseling the use of argument in which he does not believe, in order to catch some who will not accept the argument in which he does believe. Much more to the same intent might be quoted, but this is sufficient to show the aptness of the title which Mr. Crafts gives to his summary of Sunday work,—a year of artifice and fraud. The same course was pursued in the history of the early church, as is shown by the following quotation from Mosheim:



—*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.6*

“By some of the weaker brethren, in their anxiety to assist God with all their might (in the propagation of the Christian faith), such dishonest artifices were occasionally resorted to as could not, under any circumstances, admit of excuse, and were utterly unworthy of that sacred cause which they were unquestionably intended to support.”—*Commentaries, cent. 2, sec. 7. AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.7*

It was just such work as that which resulted in the establishment of the man of sin-the Papacy. It is just such work in these days that will result in the formation of a living image to that man of sin-an American Papacy.*AMS May 15, 1889, page 123.8*

E. J. W.

## May 22, 1889

**“Protection to Religious Worship, and the Bible in the Schools” American Sentinel 4, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we received from a friend in the East some questions concerning Sunday legislation, and religious teaching in the schools, which had been put to him, and which he could not answer. As they are questions that might be asked to anyone, we print them herewith and give our reply, for the benefit of all:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.1*

“Your position is no civil Sabbath laws. Such a position, carried out with our present influx of foreign element, will soon reduce our present Christian Sabbath to the level of the Continental Sabbath—a day of excursions, picnics, beer gardens, revelries, and, if desired, make a day of din or confusion right when the majority desire to engage in worship. You cry out against coercion on one side but lose sight of protection on the other. Here are what you would regard as two evils, and one or the other of them must be chosen; hence, would it not be better to have a Sunday law? Is not a village or neighborhood with a Sunday law where things are kept quiet better than one where everything runs riot on Sunday?”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.2*

“2. The position of the SENTINEL is no Bible in the schools if objected to by Catholics. Many of our text-books have the name of God in referring to him as Creator, etc. Suppose some atheist objects, shall his objection be sustained? Some ‘fogy’ objects to grammar being taught because he don’t believe in it; shall his objection be sustained?”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.3*

“Does not the matter of finances, building school-houses, and *selection of text-books lie with the majority?*—It certainly does. Then if they choose to select the best of all books for a school reader have they not power to do so, even if it does not suit the majority?”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.4*

The first question has been answered many times, but we will answer it again more in detail. The answer is very simple. The whole point is protection to religious worship on Sunday. This is the great plea that made in favor of Sunday laws. People must be protected in their right to worship. We say so too; but there is no necessity for Sunday laws in order to secure this undisturbed worship. To show that this is so, we will make some extracts from the penal codes of a few of the States. Section 302 of the penal code of California reads as follows:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.5*

“Every person who willfully disturbs or disquiets any assembly of people met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or by any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such worship is held, or so near as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting, is guilty of misdemeanor.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.6*

Such misdemeanor is punishable by “imprisonment in the county jail not exceeding six months, or by fine not exceeding \$500, or both.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.7*

The Pennsylvania law reads thus:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.8*

“If any person shall willfully or maliciously disturb, or interrupt, any meeting, society, assembly, or congregation convened for the purpose of religious worship, or for any moral, social, literary, scientific, agricultural, horticultural, or floral object, ceremony, examination, exhibition, or lecture, such persons shall on conviction be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding \$50, and suffer an imprisonment not exceeding three months, or both, or either, at the discretion of the court.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.9*

Following is the reading of the penal code of New York on this subject:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.10*

“SECTION 274.*Disturbing religious meetings.* A person who willfully disturbs, interrupts, or disquiets any assemblage of people met for religious worship, by any of the acts enumerated in the next section, is guilty of a misdemeanor.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.11*

SEC. 275. *Definition of the offense.* The following acts, or any of them, constitute disturbance of a religious meeting:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.12*

“1. Uttering any profane discourse, committing any rude or indecent act, or making any unnecessary noise, either within the place where such meeting is held, or so near it as to disturb the order and solemnity of the meeting.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.13*

“2. Engaging in, or promoting, within two miles of the place where a religious meeting is held, any racing of animals or gaming of any description.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.14*

“3. Obstructing in any manner, without authority of law, within the like disturbance, free passage along a highway to the place of such meeting.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.15*

From the criminal code of Illinois we quote the following:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.16*

“Whoever, by menace, profane swearing, vulgar language, or any unusual conduct, interrupts or disturbs any assemblage of people met for the worship of God, shall be fined not exceeding \$100. Whosoever, during the time of holding camp or field meetings for religious purposes, within one mile of the place of holding such meeting, hawks or peddles goods, wares, or merchandise, or, without the permission of the authorities having charge of such a meeting, establishes any tent, booth, or other place for provisions or refreshments, or sells or gives away, or offers to sell or give away, any spirits, liquor, wine, cider, or beer, or engage in gaming, or horse-racing, or exhibits, or fairs, shall be fined not exceeding \$100 in each offense.”—*Illinois Statute, chap. 35, paragraphs 53, 54.**AMS May 22, 1889, page 129.17*

Section 189 of the criminal code of Colorado reads thus:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.1*

“Whoever shall be guilty of any noise, rout, or amusement on the first day of the week, called Sunday, whereby the peace of any private family may be disturbed, or who shall by a disorderly, immoral conduct interrupt or disturb the meeting, procession, or

ceremony of any religious denomination, on either a week-day or Sunday, such person so offending shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and upon conviction therefor shall be fined any sum not exceeding \$50.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.2*

Section 4,853 of the criminal code of Tennessee says:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.3*

“If any person willfully disturb or disquiet any assemblage of persons met for religious worship, by noise, profane discourse, rude or indecent behavior, or any other act at or near the place of worship, he shall be fined not less than twenty nor more than two hundred dollars, and may also be imprisoned not exceeding six months in the county jail.”*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.4*

We do not know of any State that does not have similar provisions. It is very evident, therefore, that Sunday laws are not needed in order to protect people in their right to rest and worship undisturbed on Sunday. And since, notwithstanding the existence of these statutes, it is claimed that Sunday laws are needed in order to protect the Christian Sabbath, or, as the Blair Sunday-Rest bill says, “to protect the religious observance of the day,” it is evident that the de-sire is not to protect those who do keep Sunday, since they have protection already, but to compel others to observe the Sunday religiously against their will.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.5*

A case in point occurred in this city not long since. At a public meeting, the pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, and others, complained very bitterly that a service had been disturbed on the previous Sunday, by the beating of drums in a circus tent, which had been pitched adjoining his church. He stated that at times it had been almost impossible for the congregation to hear the sermon, because of the outside din. An impassioned plea was made for a Sunday law in California, so that congregations might be protected in their worship. The case was put very strongly, so as to excite sympathy, and no doubt many persons were moved by it to resolve to do all in their power to secure a Sunday law. Yet the readers of this article will see from the section quoted from the penal code of California, that ample provision already exists for the stopping of all such disturbances. The church where this thing happened is not

more than two minutes' walk from police headquarters, and it is safe to say that in five minutes from the first beat of the drum, the offenders might have been lodged in a cell at the police station. Yet those people endured all the disquiet, rather than avail themselves of the provisions already made. Why was this?—The only reason that can be given is that if they had demonstrated that religious service can be conducted quietly, and that any disturbance to it can be promptly checked, they would deprive themselves of their strongest arguments for the enactment of the Sunday law.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.6*

We trust that our friends will save these quotations that we have made, and secure others if they can, and use them whenever it is claimed that Sunday laws are a necessity in order that worship may be conducted undisturbed.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.7*

The second question concerning the Bible in the schools might be answered briefly, as follows:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.8*

1. The position of the SENTINEL is not simply “no Bible in the schools if objected to by the Catholics.” We are utterly opposed to the teaching of the Bible in public schools, no matter whether desired by Catholics or Protestants, or both. The reason is that the schools established by the State were not established for the purpose of teaching religion, and are not competent to do that work. What will be taught will be simply the empty shell, destitute of all power, for it is claimed that it is not desired to have the Bible in the schools for the purpose of teaching religion, but simply as a reading book. We reply that the Bible is essentially a religious book, and it is nothing less. The history and biography which it contains were written for the sole purpose of showing God's dealings with men. They are practical object lessons in real piety, or else in the results of a failure properly to acknowledge God; and when the Bible is read or studied with any other object than to arrive at a knowledge of the religion which it inculcates, it is read and studied to no profit.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.9*

There is no point in the argument that if the Bible is kept out of the schools, all books in which the name of God occurs should likewise be kept out, else some atheist will be disturbed. It is a matter of fact

there is no such thing as a real atheist. This was well shown in a convention of so-called atheists in Paris a few years ago, in which one of the leaders said, in an impassioned address, "I am an atheist, thank God." *AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.10*

2. No one ever heard of a conscientious objection to the teaching of grammar. There is no parallel whatever between the teaching of grammar and the teaching of the Bible. There is no difference of opinion concerning grammar, arithmetic, and geography. Those principles are well known and agreed to by all men of all nations and all classes. If the same thing were true in regard to the Bible, there could be no objection to having it taught in the schools. We say that if there were no disagreement as to the doctrines which the Bible teaches,—if all men who know anything about it were perfectly agreed upon it, as are all educated persons upon the principles of mathematics and language, and if there were no more possibility for a disagreement than there is upon the principles of these studies, there could be no objection to its being taught, because there would be nobody to object in that case. If a person did not want to study the Bible, he could refrain from studying it, just as he can now refrain from the study of the common branches of knowledge, if he wishes to remain ignorant. *AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.11*

This covers the whole ground. The trouble with those who plead for the Bible in the public schools, is that they do not discriminate between it and the common text-books. As we have before charged, they bring the Bible down to a level of grammar and geography; thus they convict themselves of the very things they charge us with, namely, of working against true religion and a real knowledge of the Bible. We think anyone can see the justness of our opposition. We are opposed to the teaching of the Bible in the public schools, because we love the Bible, and we do not want to have people steeled against what influence it has in the world, by having it taught as a thing of no more importance than grammar. *AMS May 22, 1889, page 130.12*

E. J. W.

**"The Blair Bill" American Sentinel 4, 17.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is the heading of the communication which follows, to which we herewith reply. While it is true that the Blair bill is dead, by the adjournment of Congress, yet the movement which resulted in the presentation of the Blair bill, is not dead, and we are assured that, as soon as the next Congress assembles, another bill will be presented, which will be even stronger than the one introduced by Senator Blair; therefore, it is not out of place to consider that bill even now. Following is the communication:—*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.1*

“EDITORS OF THE AMERICAN SENTINEL: I wholly misapprehend the meaning of the Blair bill, if it mean anything more than that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest. To this construction of the bill, I give my unqualified assent; to any other meaning of the proposed law, I am uncompromisingly opposed. I never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath, according to his own convictions of right.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.2*

“It is in man’s physical nature to need one day of rest in the week; all toiling creatures, whose muscular energy is strung to its highest pitch to drive life’s varied pursuits, or to promote man’s pleasure, need a time to recuperate these worn and often over-taxed powers. For them, as well as for man, I plead for one day of rest at least. With the same zeal I would plead for religious freedom; I would compel no man to observe for rest, and for religious exercise, a sabbath that he believes is not the day appointed by the divine Being. When we give away one item of that faith, so well expressed by our institutions, we take one step toward that despotism that has over-run the hopes of religious freedom in the world, one step from the principles upon which our institutions were founded.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.3*

“Am I mistaken in the meaning of the Blair bill? or are you not wrong in opposing a measure, a specification, that is comprehended in the great principle upon which your faith is founded?*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.4*

“J. W. HERVEY, A.M., M.D.



*“Indianapolis, Ind., Feb. 4, 1889.”*

The fact is, as our correspondent suggests, that he wholly misapprehends the meaning of the Blair bill. He certainly did not read it very closely or he could have seen that it did mean a great deal more than that some day in each week should be observed, but that any individual was at liberty to select his own day of rest. It was entitled a “bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship.” In the new bill the word “protect” is to be substituted for “promote.” Now this contemplates nothing less than the enforcement of the observance of the first day of the week, and that upon every individual within the jurisdiction of the proposed law. *AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.5*

That this is true, is shown by the first section, which says that “no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform, or authorize to be performed, any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, game, amusement, or recreation to the disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord’s day, or during any part thereof, in any territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States.” In the new bill this is to be made stronger. Instead of prohibiting work, amusements, or such like, “to the disturbance of others,” they propose to prohibit any work or amusement that is done “in public,” whether it disturbs anybody else or not. It needs no comment to show that our statement is true, that the purpose of the Blair bill is to compel everybody to keep Sunday. *AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.6*

This is further shown by the introduction. It states that the object of the bill is to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week, and to promote, or protect, its observance as a day of religious worship. Now as we have before shown in the SENTINEL, there are ample laws in every State to protect the people in their rest upon Sunday, and also to protect them in their religious worship. There is no necessity for a Sunday law in order that people

may be protected in the enjoyment of Sunday rest and worship. But note that it is not the people that are to be protected, but the day. The bill is “to protect the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship.” That is a different thing from protecting the people. We protect a flower garden by building a fence around it, and putting up a sign warning people to keep off. So Sunday is to be protected as a day of religious worship by putting the fence of the law around it, and warning everybody not to trespass upon it. There is a vast difference between protecting people in their worship on Sunday, and protecting Sunday as a day of religious worship. The former, the State is in duty bound to do, just as it is in duty bound to protect all citizens, at all times, who conduct themselves peaceably. The latter it has no business whatever to do.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.7*

Our friend says that he would give his unqualified sanction to a bill providing that some one of the days in each week shall be observed as a day of rest, and gives as his reason that man’s physical nature needs one day of rest in a week. We hardly think he has considered this matter carefully, or he would not make so sweeping an assertion. We agree that it would be all right for the Government to enact a law that every man may rest one day in each week, or, in other words, that no one shall be compelled to labor seven days in a week. But that would be the same as saying that no peaceable, law-abiding citizen shall be interfered with in his right to conduct his own affairs as he pleases, and our laws already provide that. It is a most pernicious idea that the State must compel a man by force to do everything that is for his physical or moral welfare. Let that principle be admitted, and then every man’s privilege of judgment is taken away. He is left no chance to decide what is good and what is bad. The State decides for him, and he becomes simply a machine to be manipulated by the Government. Moreover, such a principle as that invests the law-makers with infallibility, in that it assumes that they are fully qualified to decide what is best for every man, when, as a matter of fact, they may be far less qualified than many men in private life.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 131.8*

It is altogether a false assumption by National Reformers and their allies, that the Sabbath is for the purpose of securing to the people physical rest. The only Sabbath law that we know of is the fourth

commandment, and that says nothing about man's nature requiring a weekly rest. The Sabbath was ordained for the purpose of worship, and for that alone. Of course, if it is observed, there is a benefit physically, but that is only a secondary matter in connection with the Sabbath observance; and when professed Christians appeal for Sunday laws on the basis of man's physical necessity, they virtually deny the morality of the Sabbath.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 132.1*

Our correspondent says he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to observe his own Sabbath according to his own convictions of right. That is good, and we hope that after a little further consideration he will say with us, that he never will support any law that takes from the citizen the right to take his rest whenever he feels like it.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 132.2*

National Reformers make the very specious plea that seventh-day people will be at full liberty to observe their Sabbath, even though a strict Sunday law be enforced. Now here is a query. Seventh-day people form a very small minority of the population of this country. Now if the Sunday-law advocates are sincere in their statements that they will lose their rest-day if they do not have a civil law to protect them, and to compel others to rest on that day; if they are sincere in their statement that "the liberty of rest for each depends upon a law of rest for all," how can they say that seventh-day people will have perfect liberty to keep their Sabbath even though a strict Sunday law be enacted? If the great majority of people, who profess to regard Sunday as a sacred day, cannot keep it without a law enforcing its observance, how can the very small minority of people who regard the seventh day holy keep that day with no civil law favoring it, but with a law which tends to compel them to use it for labor, by depriving them of one of their regular working days? We apprehend that no one will attempt to harmonize this.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 132.3*

As a matter of fact, seventh-day people can and do observe Saturday strictly with no law to favor them, and even with laws discriminating against them; therefore, it is a self-evident fact that Sunday people may, if they will, observe the first day of the week without any Sunday law. Therefore, it is evident, still further, that the

only reason why they desire a Sunday law is that they may compel others, against their will, to keep the day. Sunday laws are always and everywhere oppressive, immoral, and antichristian.*AMS May 22, 1889, page 132.4*

E. J. W.

## May 29, 1889

**“Dr. Crafts at Pittsburg” American Sentinel 4, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The event of the evening of the second day of the National Reform Convention at Pittsburg was the speech by Dr. Crafts, entitled, “Liberty and the Sabbath.” With the exception of the speech by Dr. McAllister on the “School Theory of Education,” this was the only one of the speeches, so far as we have received them, containing anything worthy of notice. That which makes this speech noteworthy is not its logic, because it has none, but the perverted ideas of liberty to which the speaker gave expression. In the beginning of his speech, he referred to the Sunday-law petition, copies of which had been placed in the seats, and which he read. It has been changed somewhat, so we will quote it as it now reads:—*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.1*

*“To the United States Senate.*—The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the Government’s mails, military service, and inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia, and Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, excepting works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week, by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.”*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.2*

Concerning this, Mr. Crafts said: “It may be best to define it as a supplement to the State Sabbath law, by doing through Congress what the States cannot do,—giving protection to thousands beyond the jurisdiction of the State laws.” From this it seems that Mr. Crafts’s idea of liberty and protection is that they shall be guaranteed only to those who think as he does; and that everybody else must be deprived of liberty and protection. Mr. Crafts knows as well as we do that public worship is already protected, and that no Sunday law could afford any better protection to it than it has now. His continually harping on that string shows that he is working for a

law from some other motive than that of reason and regard for religion.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.3*

While we are talking about protection to religious worship, it may not be amiss to inquire why those who religiously and regularly observe another day, are not entitled to as much protection as those who observe the first day. If Mr. Crafts says it is because those who observe another day are in the wrong, then he contradicts his statement that the Sunday law is not a religious law. To say that Saturday is not the correct day for Christians to observe, and to say that Sunday is the proper day, and ought, therefore, to be enforced by the State, is to say that the State should decide for people on questions of religious duty, or, in other words, that the State should act as Pope.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.4*

But the answer which, Mr. Crafts does give is that those who observe another day are so few that they are not worth noticing. In his speech he spoke of the opposition to his movement as composed of “two little Christian sects, professedly Christian,—the Seventh-day Adventists and Seventh-day Baptists, who, with the Jews, make about one per cent. of the population.” Of course he knows that his wished-for law will work great disadvantage to these people, but he philosophically answers that it is better for a few to suffer in order that many may be benefited. This is what the false-hearted high priest Caiaphas said when the council were considering whether or not Jesus should be tolerated. He said that it was expedient that one man should die in order that the whole nation should not perish. So, in order to save the nation, they put the one man to death; nevertheless, the whole nation miserably perished, and for the very reason that they rejected Jesus in order to gave themselves.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.5*

Now we will say this, that any law which works injustice to a single individual in a nation, is an unjust law; and the man that talks about securing liberty for the multitude by means of a law which shall deprive a few equally deserving persons of their liberty, shows that he does not understand the first principles of liberty and justice, but is at heart a tyrant. True liberty knows no favoritism. It may seem to some of the Sunday-law workers that liberty for the people can be

obtained only by a law which will deprive some people of their liberty; but they will find in the end, that they are grievously mistaken, as did the Jewish people who crucified Christ in order that they might retain their nationality. Their ideas of liberty, and of gaining it, are just such ideas as were held by Napoleon, who, in order to gain his ends, which no doubt he forced himself to believe were for the good of the people, heartlessly sacrificed thousands of men. When people find that in their supposed march to liberty they are obliged to trample upon the rights of a single individual, they should halt, and take that as a sure indication that they are on the wrong road.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.6*

Referring to the observers of the seventh day as in the front rank of opposers to the Sunday-law movement, he said that they constituted but one per cent. of the population, and added, "And yet they would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter." To this we have to say, first, that the observers of the seventh day do not ask anybody to yield their convictions, unless their convictions are that everyone who does not observe Sunday should be deprived of their civil rights. Sunday-law advocates profess to think that the opposers of their movement want to deprive them of their rest-day. Nothing could be more untrue. The opposers of the Sunday law are perfectly willing that everybody who wishes to keep Sunday should be allowed the fullest liberty to do so, and be protected in his worship on that day to the fullest extent. We challenge Mr. Crafts, or any of his co-workers, to quote a single line from any opposer of the Sunday law, whether he be Christian, Jew, or infidel, which could possibly be construed as indicating any desire whatever to deprive any individual of the fullest liberty to rest and to worship on Sunday. The intolerance is all on the other side. It is the Sunday-law advocates who have such overweening ambition to rule, that they cannot enjoy their Sunday rest so long as any person who differs with them is granted freedom of action. The opposers of the Sunday-law movement simply ask equal and exact justice for all.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 137.7*

Again, by his statement that the seventh-day people, who, as he says, form one per cent. of the population, would have the other ninety-nine per cent. yield their convictions in this matter, he

conveys the idea that ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States have decided convictions in favor of Sunday. Now if that were true, they would not be asking for a Sunday law. If ninety-nine per cent. of the population of the United States were conscientious observers of the Sunday, the day would be observed so strictly that the labor that would be done by the one per cent. would not make a ripple on the surface of society. But let us look at figures for a moment. The population of the United States is about sixty-five million, but the number of church-members in the United States, both Protestant and Catholic, is not more than thirteen million. That is, only twenty per cent. of the people of the United States are even nominally Christian. This is a good deal less than ninety-nine per cent., but not all of these church-members are desirous of a Sunday law. We have in our possession the statements of prominent religious workers to the effect that the larger part of the present disregard for Sunday is due to members of churches. It is repeatedly stated that if it were not for the patronage of church-members the Sunday newspaper could not exist. Certainly, then, the conviction that Sunday should be observed strictly cannot be overwhelmingly strong, even among the small minority of the people who are nominally Christian. Then there are many thousands of people who conscientiously observe the first day of the week, who are as strongly opposed to a Sunday law as any seventh-day person can possibly be. Mr. Crafts himself only claims ten million petitioners presented to Congress shows that only a few hundred people actually signed the petition; and it is making a very liberal estimate to say that the entire number of people in the United States, who are zealous for a Sunday law, is less than a million. So then we may say that one per cent. of the population desire a Sunday law, and are determined to have it in spite of the opposition, and the passive indifference, of the other ninety-nine per cent. *AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.1*

Mr. Crafts says: "It is a very shallow objection, the attempt to charge that this is at the bottom of a Catholic conspiracy to put Catholicism in this country." We do not know of anybody who makes this charge. We know very well that the Roman Catholics are not at the bottom of this movement. We should not think any the worse of it if they were. We know that there are many Catholics who are opposed to it. All the wickedness in the world does not result from



what is called Catholicism, neither is all the goodness bound up in Protestantism. Those who are engineering this Sunday movement call themselves Protestants, but they have not the faintest conception of what Protestantism is. Protestantism derives its name from the protest of the German Princes at the Diet of Spires against religious interference with the Government and the rights of the people. A man is not necessarily a Protestant because he calls himself one. When these professed Protestants labor for the very thing against which the German Princes protested, they show that they are not Protestants, but Papists, at heart.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.2*

Mr. Crafts devoted a little time to the consideration of the objection that the Sunday law would be unconstitutional. His answer is as follows: "In cases where it has been carried up to the Supreme Court of the State the decisions have been without reserve that such laws are perfectly constitutional. It seems strange that this cry should still be raised, and the curious thing about it is that in the papers that publish these objections there is not the slightest intimation of the decisions of the courts in this matter." A fitting answer to this is the following incident related of that eminent lawyer, Henry W. Paine, of Maine. One day Mr. Paine was riding in a horse-car, reading a sheep-skin-bound volume of law reports. An acquaintance hailed him, and said, "See here, Paine, do you have to study law still?" "This is not law," said Paine. "It is only a collection of decisions of the Massachusetts Supreme Court." So it may be said of the Supreme Court decisions that Sunday laws are constitutional. They are not law. They are not justice. They cannot make wrong right. Just as Chief Justice Taney's decision in the Dred Scott case did not make slavery any more constitutional than it was before.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.3*

Mr. Crafts claims that the clause of the first amendment of the Constitution, which says that Congress shall not prohibit the free exercise of religion, is infringed in this country. He says: "Certainly it is an infringement of the free exercise of religion, when the public service is so managed that hundreds and thousands of employes in the service of the Government cannot have their rightful privilege accorded them. No deeply conscientious Christian man can take an office in the whole Post-office Department. No man who has a strict

conscience can either be a postmaster or a post-office clerk, and I say it is an infringement on the free exercise of religion.” What about the man who has conscience in the observance of the seventh day? He cannot occupy any position in the Post-office Department, because the post-office is regularly open continually on Saturday, when his conscientious convictions compel him to refrain from all labor. Mr. Crafts does not expect that this condition of things will ever be changed. On the contrary, he intends to make it even more uncomfortable for them than it is at present. Therefore, according to Mr. Crafts’s own statement, he and his followers intend to perpetuate that infringement of the Constitution. We have never heard a Sunday-law advocate admit more plainly that the passage of a strict Sunday law would prohibit the free exercise of religion.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.4*

But as a matter of fact, the keeping open of post-offices on Sunday does not interfere in the slightest degree with the free exercise of a man’s religion. Any man who has conscience in regard to Sunday will keep it. There is no law compelling him to accept a position under the Government. There are thousands of people who keep Sunday strictly, just as there are other thousands who keep Saturday strictly, who have never dreamed that they were being interfered with,—that their religious freedom was infringed by the mere fact that somebody else worked while they were resting.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.5*

One more point in Mr. Crafts’s speech we will notice, and then leave him for the present. He said: “We will now notice the work of the seventh-day Christian people who are doing so much in this country to disturb the objects which we seek. I have been criticised for calling this people Saturdarians. They say that I have viewed that work a little uncharitably; but we claim that they make a fetich of Saturday.” If “Saturdarians” is a proper term to apply to those who observe the seventh day, then “Sundarians” must be a proper term to apply to those who observe the first day of the week. Mr. Crafts would undoubtedly think us uncharitable if we should apply it to him.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.6*

Mr. Crafts says that the seventh-day people make a fetich of Saturday. Let us look into this matter. A fetich, according to

Webster, is “a material thing, living or dead, which is made the object of brutish and superstitious worship, as among certain African tribes.” Now Mr. Crafts charges seventh-day people of making a fetich of Saturday, because they observe it strictly. Suppose we look at the other side. Mr. Crafts and his fellow-workers make a great parade of their conscientious regard for Sunday. Now if the simple fact that seventh-day people observe Saturday strictly is evidence that they make a fetich of it, then it must be that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. Indeed, he is a hundred fold more open to the charge of fetichism than seventh-day people are, for whereas seventh-day people are strict observers of Saturday for themselves only, Mr. Crafts not only observes Sunday strictly, but de-sires to compel everybody else to do so. This is one of the characteristics of fetichism; for it is well known that nothing will more quickly exasperate the ignorant devotee than to have people lightly regard his fetich. He not only holds it in superstitious reverence, but he thinks that everybody else ought to do the same; and the less worthy the object of his worship is of adoration, the more intense is his desire to have other people give homage to it, and the more intensely is he excited when it is disregarded.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.7*

Still further may we turn Mr. Crafts’s charge upon himself. A fetich, as before quoted, is the object of superstitious worship. “Superstition,” as defined by Webster, is “extreme and unnecessary scruples in the observance of religious rites not commanded.” Now there is nowhere in the Bible a command for the observance of Sunday. We defy any individual to produce even a semblance of such a command. Mr. Crafts manifests extreme scruples in the observance of Sunday, and it is certain that he manifests unnecessary scruples, in that he wishes to compel others to do so against their will. Therefore his regard for it is superstition; and since a fetich is the object of superstitious worship, we have proved conclusively that Mr. Crafts makes a fetich of Sunday. The columns of the SENTINEL are open to him to clear himself from this charge if he can.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 138.8*

E. J. W.

**“Sunday Laws Antichristian” American Sentinel 4, 18.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* (New York *Mail and Express*) of February 8 contained an article entitled, "The Sabbath and the Individual," by Rev. George S. Mott, D. D., the vice-president of the American Sabbath Union for New Jersey, from which we quote the following reasons why Sunday laws and their penalties must be made universal:—*AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.1*

"The person who keeps the law must not be put out and disadvantaged thereby, and this would be the case were there no penalties for breaking Sabbath laws. The merchant who closes his store might find that his neighbor who keeps open on Sunday was drawing away a trade which belongs to him. Now we must not permit the Sunday-keeping merchant to be the loser because he regards the law, and so must it be with all kinds of labor. Let public sentiment in favor of Sunday law die away, and try to popularize in this country the Sunday of France, and the American will not be protected in his day of rest. Thus he would be compelled to work on that day or lose his situation. No public conscience or statutes will be on his side." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.2*

This is one of the most common arguments for, a Sunday law, and is urged by doctors of divinity who claim to be working in the interests of the gospel and pure morality; but to our mind it is one of the strongest evidences of the antichristian character of all Sunday legislation. A Christian is a follower of Christ, that is, a follower of his example and teaching. Now let us quote a few words from his lips, that we may have his statements concerning what must be done by those who follow him:—*AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.3*

*Matthew 5:10-12*: "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven. Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for any sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in Heaven; for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.4*

*Luke 6:22, 26*: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and shall reproach you,

and cast out your name as evil, for the son of man's sake." "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for so did their fathers to the false prophets." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.5*

*Matthew 7:13, 14:* "Enter ye in at the strait gate; for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat; because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.6*

*Matthew 16:24, 25:* "Then said Jesus unto his disciples, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.7*

*Luke 14:27:* "And whosoever cloth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.8*

*John 15:18-20:* "If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you. Remember the word that I said unto you, The servant is not greater than his lord. If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you; if they have kept my saying, they will keep yours also." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.9*

*John 16:33:* "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." *AMS May 29, 1889, page 139.10*

The American Sabbath Union proposes to change this order of things that Christ prophesied should exist. He said that as it was before his first advent, so it should be till the end of time: the righteous should be evil spoken of by the world, and would have greater difficulty in making a living. He expressly told his followers that they would be cast out even as he had been; that they could not plan for ease in this life, and at the same time secure the life to come. He taught them that, when there was a question of right and wrong, they should not parley, nor take anxious thought as to what they should eat or drink or wherewithal they should be clothed, if

they should pursue a right course, but that they should first seek the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and trust him for their necessary support. He expressly stated that if a man did not take up his cross and deny himself, he could not be his disciple.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.1*

Now, suppose the American Sabbath Union succeeds in getting laws upholding the Christian religion, and making it easy for a man to profess Christianity, making it impossible for him to suffer any loss thereby, what would be the result? It would simply show that the Christianity that was thus professed was not Christianity at all, but a false profession thereof. By their claiming that they are going to have the religion of Christ respected, and to secure those who profess it from being put to disadvantage, they are doing their best to prove that Christ was a false prophet. But this cannot be done. Christ spoke truth. He did not say that the majority of men would reject truth because he wanted them to do so, but because he knew just what they would do. National Reformers may say as much as they please that, although their laws will make it easy for men to profess Christianity and to comply with the outward forms of it, they will not hinder them from being real Christians at heart, and true followers of Christ; but before they can make their claim good, they will have to prove that the Bible is untrue.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.2*

Jesus said: "Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat;" and that the way to life is narrow, and that few will find it. But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make the way to life so broad that nobody can help finding it; and then if anybody has a desire to follow the Saviour, and to walk in the narrow path, it will pursue him with a goad and compel him to walk in the broad way. But "the Scripture cannot be broken." The broad way will be till the end of time the way to destruction. And so, when the National Reformers shall have succeeded in getting their system of Christianity so protected by civil law that nobody can suffer any inconvenience in obeying its demands, they will simply have succeeded in changing the truth of God into a lie, and in leading people to destruction while making them believe that they are leading them to everlasting life.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.3*

Christ never authorized anybody to offer ease and comfort as an inducement for people to follow him. He had no ease while on earth, and he said that it is enough that the servant be as his Lord. When he sent Ananias to baptize Saul of Tarsus, he said, "I will show him how great things he must suffer for my sake." The American Sabbath Union says: "We must show men how little they will have to suffer, and how prosperous they may be in business, for the Lord's sake." Is it not antichrist?*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.4*

When a man came to Christ, saying, "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest," he replied: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." He was "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," and he says, "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?" But the American Sabbath Union proposes to make Christianity very popular; therefore it proposes to lead men away from Christ and pure Christianity.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.5*

The apostle Paul says, "If we suffer, we shall also reign with him;" but the American Sabbath Union proposes to make it impossible for anybody to reign with Christ, by making it impossible for anybody to suffer with him. Again he says of the children of God that they are "heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified together." But the American Sabbath Union says that it must not be possible for anybody to be made to suffer for Christ. Therefore we say that the American Sabbath Union is an antichristian institution, devoted to the suppression of pure Christianity, and the propagation of hypocrisy and dead formalism; and to just that extent, also, is it an enemy of mankind. Let every lover of pure Christianity and of his fellow-men work heart and soul against its iniquitous work.*AMS May 29, 1889, page 140.6*

E. J. W.

**June 5, 1889**

**“The Secular Theory of Education” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Thursday morning, April 25, Rev. David McAllister, of Pittsburg, delivered an address upon the above subject before the National Reform Convention assembled at that place. In beginning he referred to a paper that had just been read on “The Romish Assault on the Common Schools,” stating that his address came in very appropriately after that topic, for the reason, as he said, that “when this assault is understood by multitudes of our citizens, they can see no way of meeting it except by the secular theory of education.” He then proceeded as follows:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.1*

“What commands my respect for the Catholics is this, that they maintain that education cannot be complete when that education ignores religion. They are on the right ground there. Man is a religious as well as an intellectual being, and no scheme of education, whether by the family, or the church, or the State, is worthy the name that ignores the higher part of man’s nature. The only mistake with Romanists is this, that the religion which they insist upon it; the religion of Romanists. No other religion will they have. They won’t accept the principles that are common to Romanian with Protestantism, for there are such principles. They won’t allow these to be taught, for they maintain that any system of religion that leaves out what they regard as essential is utterly defective, and heresy is to be condemned, and heretics who embrace it are to be persecuted.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.2*

There are several points about this paragraph which we wish to notice. We are willing to admit that a man is not perfectly developed whose education does not embrace the moral and the physical as well as the purely intellectual. But that does not prove that it is the duty of the State to educate him in all of these principles. Indeed, it is an open question with leading educators how far the State should go in education on even a secular basis. There are not a few who maintain that the State should teach nothing except the common English branches, leaving all scientific and classical studies to be



provided for by the individual himself, or by his guardians. Certainly then the statement that man is a religious as well as an intellectual being,—that no scheme of education is complete that ignores the higher branch of man's nature,—proves nothing whatever as to how or by whom this higher part should be educated. We hold that it is not the province of the State to furnish religious education of any kind whatever; that for the State to get into the business of teaching religion is directly opposed to our Government, in that it involves class legislation. There are so many conflicting views concerning religion, and the public schools cannot by any possibility teach them all, so that if the State should go into the business of religious education it would be obliged to discriminate between a large class of citizens as worthy as those who are favored.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.3*

Again, note Mr. McAllister's statement that the only mistake with the Romanist idea of education is that the religion upon which they insist is the religion of Romanists. In this they are perfectly consistent, and nobody can justly find any fault with them for it. Protestants who are worthy of the name must take a similar position, and insist that whatever religion is taught their children, whether by the State or otherwise, shall be none but the Protestant religion. But by this token we know that National Reformers are not Protestants, because they are willing to join with Romanists. It is true that Mr. McAllister wishes to compromise, having the State teach such branches as are common to both Protestants and Romanists; but he might as well go right over to the Catholic Church at once; for when he begs the State to teach the principles of the Christian religion, and says that the principles which he desires to have taught are only those which are common to both Protestants and Romanists, he shows that in his mind there are no distinctive features of Protestantism, as compared with Romanism, that are worthy of being held.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.4*

Now let us see where this will lead to. The Romanist will not consent to any such fusion. He thinks that the principles of his religion which differ from Protestantism are vital, and he will not consent that they shall be ignored. In this he is consistent. The only reason why he remains a Romanist is because he regards his religion as superior to Protestantism. But Mr. McAllister, speaking

for the National Reform Association, is not so strenuous in regard to his religion. He is willing to drop every feature that is different from Catholicism. The one point upon which Romanists and National Reformers are agreed is that the State shall support religious teaching. Now since the Romanists are decided in their convictions, and refuse to compromise their religion, while the National Reformers are willing to compromise, it is very evident that the stronger and more decided party will carry the day. That is, when National Reformers see that they cannot have religion taught by the State without joining with Catholics, and that the Catholics will not yield, they will compromise, not simply on those principles that are common to Protestantism and Romanism, but on Romanism pure and simple. That this will be the result is further evident from a statement made in the *Christian Statesman* of August 31, 1881, by the Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel, who, speaking of the desire of the National Reformers to secure the co-operation of Roman Catholics, said:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.5*

“We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches as such; but the time is come to make repeated advances, and gradually to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to exhibit it. It is one of the necessities of the situation.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 145.6*

Now no matter how ardently the Roman Catholic might desire religious education by the State, they would be very foolish to yield a single principle in their religion in order to gain it, when they can see clearly by such statements as this, that by remaining firm they can bring professed Protestants to their position. When the National Reformers say that they are willing to make repeated advances, and to endure repeated rebuffs, and will gladly accept co-operation in any form in which the Roman Church exhibits it, all the Roman Church has to do is to wait. She is well assured that the National Reformers will keep up their wooing, and she is sure of gaining all that she may exact from so ardent a suitor. National Reformers may deny that their scheme, if successful, will make Romanism the ruling power in this country; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of such statements as those of Mr. Scovel and Dr. McAllister.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 146.1*

In saying this we would not have anyone think that we objected to the National Reform scheme just because it will result in Roman supremacy. We would just as soon see the State enforce the Catholic religion as the Protestant religion. Not but what we have decided convictions in matters of religion, but we have no choice as to what religion the State shall enforce, if it is to enforce any. The Protestant religion united with the State would be no better than Mohammedism. It is the union of Church and State that we protest against. It was by such protesting that Protestantism originated. He who does not protest against such a union is not a Protestant; and when so-called Protestantism is enforced by the State, it ceases to be Protestantism. The reason why we make so much of the statements of National Reformers, both direct and indirect, that they are willing to join hands with Romanists, and of the fact that Romanism will thereby be supreme in the State, is that we thus show clearly that their scheme does embrace the union of Church and State; because Romanism is avowedly in favor of a Church and State union, with the Church as senior partner.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 146.2*

This one point is sufficient to condemn Mr. McAllister's entire speech. We might well leave the article here for the present, but will call attention to one little absurdity. Dr. Mc-Allister said:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 146.3*

"I might pursue at considerable length a line of argument that has become very familiar with the National Reformers; but I will only revert to it very briefly. It is this: The great mistake that is made by secularists is in comparing the State itself to any mere business association. Secular education rests upon the social compact theory of government—a theory that has been exploded long ago. The best political papers do not entertain it for a moment. There is something back of the social compact theory. Men come together and make a covenant, and there is a compact. You cannot have a compact without the Nation, and there must be a Nation behind the compact. It is the Nation itself that makes the compact. The duties of government are laid upon it. Here is the being that is to undertake the work of education."*AMS June 5, 1889, page 146.4*

Let us make a parallel. Here is a railroad company. A number of

men have come together and made a compact, or agreement. They mutually pledge themselves to work together in this line of business, and thus they form a company. They secure a charter and become a corporation. Now we may say there can be no there before the compact, that there must be a Nation behind the compact. But a Nation is not a mere aggregation of individuals, although there can be no Nation without people. Ten million people thrown together promiscuously within a certain territory, each one independent of everybody else, would not be a Nation. They become a Nation only when they unite their interests, and covenant together for mutual protection, and agree upon certain officers to execute their wishes. But according to the National Reform idea there has been a Nation stalking around this American continent from time immemorial, waiting for centuries for people to settle in order that it might make a compact with them, and have people to carry out its designs. Surely, if the National Reform scheme were not inherently wicked, the absurdities into which intelligent men are obliged to run in order to foster it, should consign it to oblivion. But people love to be humbugged.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 146.5*

E. J. W.

**“A True National Reform Government” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Century* of April, 1888, Mr. George Kennan had an article on “Russian Penal Code,” from which in the August SENTINEL we copied what it had to say on the subject of religion. In that it was shown clearly that the Russian Government, with all its tyranny and intolerance, is the very kind of government that the National Reformers are working for. In the April *Century*, this present year, Mr. Kennan gives us a view of the workings of the Russian police department, in which is shown very clearly the working of National Reform principles. The following extract from the article will enable the reader to judge for himself:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.1*

“The police, with the Minister of the Interior at their head, control, by means of passports, the movements of all the inhabitants of the empire; they keep thousands of suspects constantly under

surveillance; they ascertain and certify to the courts the liabilities of bankrupts; they conduct pawnbrokers' sales of unredeemed pledges; they give certificates of identity to pensioners and all other persons who need them; they superintend repairs of roads and bridges; they exercise supervision over all theatrical performances, concerts, tableaux, theater programs, posters, and street advertisements; they collect statistics, enforce sanitary regulations, make searches and seizures in private houses, read the correspondence of suspects, take charge of the bodies of persons found dead, 'admonish' church-members who neglect too long to partake of the Holy Communion, and enforce obedience to thousands of multifarious orders and regulations intended to promote the welfare of the people or to insure the safety of the State. The legislation relating to the police fills more than five thousand sections in the Svod Zakonof, or collection of Russian laws, and it is hardly an exaggeration to say that in the peasant villages, away from the centers of education and enlightenment, the police are the omnipresent and omnipotent regulators of all human conduct—a sort of incompetent bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.2*

"In order to give the readers of the Century an idea of the nature and infinite variety of the trans-actions regulated in Russia by the Government through the police, I will quote, almost at random, the titles or subjects of a few of the circular letters of instructions sent by the Minister of the Interior to the governors of various Russian provinces between 1880 and 1884. They are as follows:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.3*

"1. To regulate religious instruction in secular schools.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.4*

"2. Concerning measures to be taken to prevent horse stealing.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.5*

"3. Concerning a list of dramas that are unconditionally permitted to be put on the state.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.6*

"4. To prohibit the sale of Shimanski's Pills.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.7*

“5. To prohibit peasants from cutting young birch trees with which to decorate churches and houses on holidays.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.8*

“6. Prescribing the manner in which the censor shall supervise the reports and accounts of private societies.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.9*

“7. Concerning a removal of the restrictions upon the transportation of rendered tallow.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.10*

“8. Concerning personal identification marks in the passports of Jews.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.11*

“9. To regulate the use of mineral waters by sick or wounded officers of the army.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.12*

“10. Concerning an order for the sale of all grain by weight instead of by measure.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.13*

“11. Setting forth the circumstances under which, and the times at which, the police and other employes of the Ministry of the Interior can wear white linen covers on their caps.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.14*

“12. Concerning the question who has the right to collect subscriptions in the empire for the holy places in Palestine.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.15*

“13. To abolish the long chains used for the purpose of chaining together marching criminals in gangs of six.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.16*

“14. To regulate printing on the paper of cigarettes.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.17*

“15. Concerning the prohibition, at meetings of provincial assemblies and town councils, of the expressions of such opinions or judgments as may, from their nature, lie outside the limits of the jurisdiction of such bodies.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.18*

“16. Concerning an order prohibiting the emigration of dissenters to the Trans-Caucasus.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.19*

“17. Concerning regulations for the proper construction of houses in peasant villages.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.20*

“18. To control and regulate the transportation of animal bones.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.21*

“19. To regulate advertisements of medicines.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.22*

“20. Forbidding the use of all school-books-and appliances of instruction not approved by the Minister of the Interior and the ecclesiastical authorities.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.23*

“21. Concerning the proper method of measuring the legs of recruits for the army.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.24*

“22. Concerning meetings of school-teachers.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.25*

“23. Prescribing the manner in which permission shall be obtained for concerts, readings, theatrical performances, and other public entertainments.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.26*

“24. To require printers to send to the Departments of Police copies of all newspapers, magazines, and almanacs printed by them.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.27*

“25. To prevent the sale of quinine that is not of good quality.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.28*

“26. To regulate the censorship of price-lists, printed notes of invitation, and visiting cards.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.29*

“27. Concerning the construction of water-closets according to the removal or barrel system.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.30*

“28. Providing for the censorship of the seals, rubber stamps, and cards of private individuals and business corporations.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.31*

“29. To regulate begging for ecclesiastical institutions and for the holy places in Palestine.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.32*

“30. To regulate the sale by apothecaries of certain ‘cosmetics’—namely, soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes, and insect powder.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.33*

“These are only a few of the countless thousands of orders, directions, and regulations that come within the jurisdiction of the imperial police. Of course they are not all carried into effect. The enforcement of such a multitude of prohibitions and restrictions, affecting every province of human life, is beyond the power of any one man or any set of men; but whether they are enforced or not, they operate constantly as a bar to individual enterprise, a network to restrain every free impulse, and a clog upon all human activity.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.34*

“It is difficult for Americans to realize that such relations can exist between the people of a country and the Government as those shown by these circulars to exist in Russia. Imagine a governor of New York State issuing an order requiring all the citizens of that State to send in their seals, rubber stamps, and visiting cards for censorial supervision. Or imagine a Postmaster-General writing a circular letter to the governors of all the States prescribing rules for the regulation of the sale of soap, starch, brilliantine, tooth-brushes, and insect powder? Such an extension of the powers of the Government is to us almost inconceivable, both on account of its tyranny and on account of its preposterous absurdity; and yet such regulations are not regarded in Russia as anything extraordinary, and one sometimes finds the police engaged in work that is even more remarkable than the regulation of the sale of tooth-brushes and insect powder. I have in my possession the original report of a Russian police *pristav*, written upon a printed form, in which the officer notifies his superior that, in compliance with instructions of such and such a date, he has called upon such and such persons, who are named, and has ‘admonished’ them that they must partake of the Holy Communion, ‘upon penalty of an administrative calling to account [pod opasenient v’ protivnom sluchae kazennaho vziskania]. This document bears in capital letters at the top of the first page the words, ‘Ukase [oo-kaz] of his Imperial Majesty the



Autocrat of all the Russias: In the newspaper *Sibir* (See-beer) for July 10, 1883, it is stated, as a matter of news, that the police authorities of the city of Irkutsk have just received orders to admonish all persons who have been neglectful of religious duty, and to oblige them to partake of the sacrament. The use of the police power as a means of compelling indifferent or backsliding Christians to partake of the Holy Communion-the sending of an armed man in a blue uniform to drag another man to the table of the Prince of Peace, and to compel him to eat and drink the symbols of the broken body and shed blood of Christ-is something that has not often been seen, I think, outside of Russia, since the Dark Ages.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 147.35*

A few words only are necessary to show that this very state of things must exist in this country, if the National Reform Association, the American Sabbath Union, and the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, succeed in carrying out their (ir)religious designs. All of these associations heartily indorse Mr. Blair’s proposed amendment to the Constitution, which requires that the principles of the Christian religion be taught in the public schools. It has already been shown in these columns that the adoption of that amendment would require that text-books on religion be issued, and that both text-books and teachers should be in harmony with the standard of religion that would be recommended by the ecclesiastical authorities. But when that is done it will be necessary that a strict watch should be kept to see that no other text-book is brought in; and to see that no teacher presumes to inculcate any ideas of his own, that may be different from the established religion.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.1*

The individuals who will have this matter in charge may not be called police, but their duties will be exactly such as are defined in the articles above numbered one, twenty, and twenty-two. They will have to regulate religious instruction in secular schools. They will have to note if any books and plans of instruction are used that are not approved by the ecclesiastical authorities, and they will have to oversee the meetings of school-teachers to guard against the introduction of anything in their discussions that shall differ in any way from the standard of religion set by those ecclesiastical authorities. In short, they will have to see that religion is not

discussed at all; for it must be obvious to any thinking person that when the State, having taken counsel of the elders, prescribes the religion for its citizens, religious discussion is at an end. School-teachers will have no business to question the text-books, and they will not dare presume to make any alteration. If anything different is to be taught, it will have to be decided upon by the ecclesiastical authorities of the Nation, just as in the days of old in Europe, no new thing can be even mentioned in the school unless a new council has passed upon it. When the council shall have decided upon what shall be taught the people, the school-teachers and ministers of low degree will have simply the duty of handing to the people that which has been given to them by their superiors.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.2*

Again, the enactment of a strict national Sunday law will require that the powers of the police be very greatly magnified. Indeed, the Sunday law is often called “a police regulation,” showing that the enforcement of the law will rest largely in the hands of the police. Of course the number of police will have to be greatly increased in order that they may keep an oversight over all the people, to see that no one violates the law. It will be their duty, also, as in Russia, to “admonish” people who do not attend divine service at stated intervals. The leaders in the Sunday-law movement openly avow that their desire for a Sunday law is that people may go to church. But as we have before shown, if the mere enactment of a Sunday law does not accomplish their designs, they will necessarily have to amend it so as to require attendance at church. Moreover, Mrs. Bateham has said that what they want is the “ideal Sabbath of the Puritans;” the guarantee to rest and to worship. Now we have before us some of the laws by which that ideal Sabbath was secured, and we will quote them. In Robert Wodrow’s “Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen,” we find the following:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.3*

“It is thought expedient that ane baillie with tua of the session passed throw the towne everie Sabbath-day, and nott sic as they find absent fra the sermons ather afore or efter none, and for that effect that they pass and seiche sic hours as they think maist meit.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.4*

In his collections he says that the session allows the searchers to go into the houses and apprehend absentees from the Kirk. In the records of the governor and company of the Massachusetts Bay in New England we find that in 1629 the first Sunday law in the colony read thus:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.5*

“And to the end the Saboth may bee celebrated in a religious manner we appoint, that all that inhabite the plantacon, both for the gen'all and pticuler imploymts, may surcease their labor every Satterday throughout the yeare at 3 of the clock in the afternoon, and that they spend the rest of that day in catichising and pparacon for the Saboth, as the ministers shall direct.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.6*

This is very similar to the law now required by the American Sabbath Union. But that law was found insufficient to meet the desires of the ecclesiastics, and so in 1634 they supplemented it by the following:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.7*

“Whereas complaints hath bene made to this Court that dyvers psons within this jurisdiccon doe vsually absent themselves from church meetings vpon the Lord's day, power is therefore given to any two Assistants to heare and sensure, either by ffyne or imprisonmt (aft their discrecon), all misdemeanrs of that kind committed by any inhabitant within this jurisdiccon, provided they exceed not the ffyne of vs for one offense.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.8*

It worked then just as we have said it will work now. First was the strict Sunday law. Then was the law requiring everybody to go to church, and allowing officers to search the town to discover absentees. In 1782 an act was passed enjoining the worship of almighty God, as an essential part of the due observance of the Lord's day, and imposing a fine of ten shillings upon any said person who shall absent himself for a month from the public worship of God on the Lord's day. This statute provided for wardens to enforce the law, and gave them power to enforce it by stopping travelers, and by entering all places where they may find Sabbath-breakers.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.9*

That is the “ideal Sabbath of Puritans.” That is the condition of

things that Mrs. Bateham wishes to see in this country. When it shall be brought about we shall have a despotism fully as bad as that of Russia. Mr. Kennan says that Russian police are “a sort of incompetent, bureaucratic substitute for divine Providence.” If the American Sabbath Union and the Christian Temperance Union shall secure their desired ends, we shall have a police who will not only be a substitute for divine Providence, but a substitute for men’s consciences. Is there an American who has any love for freedom? If there is let him protest vigorously against any such usurpation. E. J. W.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 148.10*

**“That Petition Again” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

Since the AMERICAN SENTINEL has shown up so fully the crooked methods by which the Woman’s Christian Temperance and American Sabbath Unions have added signatures to their Sunday petitions, the leaders of these organizations have found it necessary to do something to divert public attention from their course, and, not being able to offer any excuse for the dishonest methods, they have had no alternative but to try to make it appear that the signatures to the protest were not obtained in a legitimate manner. Of course this does not help their cause any, for even if all the signatures to the protest were fraudulent, that would not make their duplicity any the less; but the charge which they bring serves in a measure to divert attention from themselves.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.1*

Their charge is: First, that the petition was signed only by Adventists. Second, that those who signed it who were not Adventists did so because they did not understand what they were doing. Third, that all besides Adventists who signed it were saloon keepers, who naturally disliked the idea of a Sunday law.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.2*

It needs nothing more than this statement of the charges which they make, to show to what straits they are driven to make it appear that they alone are not guilty of fraud; for one part of their charge contradicts every other part.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.3*

That the petition was not signed by Adventists exclusively is shown by the fact that, according to the Seventh-day Adventist Year Book, there are only 26,000 members of that denomination in the United States; whereas, there were 230,000 signatures to the petition that was presented in the Senate last winter, and as many more have been obtained since. These are not “representative” signatures either. Anyone who wishes to do so can verify the fact that there are 230,000 distinct signatures in the petition that was presented to Congress.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.4*

We have, however, just received a letter from a gentleman in Woodbury, N. J., a stranger to us, which covers every point of the charge which the Sunday-law people bring against those who circulated the protest. It is so concise a statement that we present it in full. It was entirely unsolicited by us, and was called out by the statements of the Western Christian Union, which were quoted in the article, “Is This the Breath of the Puritan?” in the SENTINEL of April 10. Referring to the statement that the canvassers for signatures to the protest had adopted the practice of “button-holing unsuspecting citizens in railroad waiting-rooms and street corners, not a few of whom were unfamiliar with the question,” the writer says:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.5*

“Gentlemen, I am not an Adventist; neither am I ignorant of this great question now claiming the attention of so many people of this Union. I was one of several who signed this petition against the Blair bill. I was not asked to sign this until the gentleman who circulated it was fully satisfied that I knew just what I was signing. This paper was headed by the pastor of the M. E. Church of this city; next came that of my own pastor, of the Baptist Church, followed by the signatures of several of the prominent men of our city, whose signatures I recognized. I have in my possession a petition upon which I expect to receive a number of names of Christians. All of them will know why they sign it. I do not wish to weary you, but I want to say to you that I am sorry to see those of my own faith persecuting those Christians against whom they can bring no greater charge than that they insist upon having the liberty which God has given every man, and which our National Constitution guarantees. God speed you in this work. I remain, etc.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.6*

This simple statement meets every point of the charge which they bring against us; and coupled with the fact that every point of their charge contradicts every other point, it certainly ought to put a stop to their attempt at misrepresentation; but it will not. Having started on a career of misrepresentation, and being determined to have a Sunday law, which cannot be secured by fair means, they must necessarily pursue their course to the end. Our desire is to save as many as possible from coming to that end, which will not be simply the securing of a national Sunday law.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.7*

E. J. W.

**“Exemption Clauses in Sunday Laws” American Sentinel 4, 19.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Oracle* of April 25 contains an article from a fair-minded correspondent, upon “License and Sunday Laws.” In it he makes the following reference to one who had previously written to the same paper:—*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.8*

“He says that if the Blair bill should pass, and a strict Sunday law be passed, Adventists could obey the law without any violation of their religious principles. True; but if you forbid them doing any manual labor on that day you rob them of one-sixth of their power to earn a living for their families—or at \$2.00 per day it would amount to \$104 annually. Without their consent, is that American liberty? Suppose you rest on Sunday, and we pass a law to prohibit you from working Mondays; how would that suit you? Brethren, we don’t want a Sunday law unless it has a proviso that those who conscientious keep the Sabbath shall not be prohibited from performing their usual occupation on Sunday. The Constitution is good enough as it is.”*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.9*

The writer of the above evidently believes in equal and exact justice to all; but he has not given the Sunday question sufficient thought, or he would know that there can never be any justice in connection with a Sunday law. In the first place, a seventh-day Christian could not obey a Sunday law without violating his conscience. It is not

necessary, however, to dwell upon this, since the writer would not have such compelled to rest on Sunday, because, as he rightly says, such compulsion would be robbery.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 149.10*

But those who have given much thought to the subject, whether friends or foes of Sunday legislation, know that no law can long be enforced with exceptions. We say that it is utterly impossible to enforce a Sunday law that makes an exemption in favor of those who observe the seventh day. Such a thing never has been done, and never will be done. True, there are Sunday laws which exempt observers of the seventh day; but those laws are never enforced. They remain upon the statute books as dead letters. When the time comes that enough people get in earnest to have them enforced, they secure the repeal of the exemption clause. Then they can enforce the law, and not before.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 150.1*

Take the case of Arkansas as an example. It had for a long time a Sunday law which made an exemption in favor of seventh-day people. But that law was not enforced. No attempt was made to enforce it. Finally some unto quid people concluded that the law ought to be enforced. But they could not enforce it as it was. Why?—Because there was really nothing to enforce. The exemption in favor of seventh-day observers deprived the law of all its force. So they pleaded for the repeal of that exemption section, so that no non-religious person could evade the law by professing to be an observer of the seventh day. There is no evidence that any person had ever done so; but the Sunday-law people saw plainly that that could easily be done, and that to attempt to enforce a Sunday law with an exemption section, would be like trying to trap a fox with two holes to his den. So they stopped up all chance of escape, by securing the repeal of that obnoxious section. Then the law was enforced for the first time in its existence. And right vigorously was it enforced too. Then the saloon keepers had to suffer, didn't they? Not much. They sold whisky as openly as ever, and were not even indicted therefor. It was enforced against those who had rested on Saturday, and against no others. The National Reformers of Arkansas seemed to feel a special interest in the physical welfare of the Seventh-day Adventists and the Seventh-day Baptists, for they sought to compel them to rest after they had already rested, while

others were left free not to rest at all.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 150.2*

This prosecution went on until public indignation demanded that simple toleration, if not justice, should be granted to those observers of the seventh day, all of whom were good citizens. So a bill was introduced and passed, which granted to conscientious observers of the seventh day immunity from the pains and penalties of the Sunday law. The result was that the prosecution ceased. No attempt has been made since to enforce the law. Surely this is far more than merely suggestive.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 150.3*

Now a National Sunday law is desired. Its advocates make a great show of liberality, and say that they are going to see that it exempts those who observe the seventh day. The Blair bill, however, made no such exemption. Nevertheless, fair-minded persons are caught by the pretension to liberality on the part of the National Reformers and the American Sabbath Union. But let it not be forgotten that the object of this proposed National Sunday law is to make efficient existing State Sunday laws. But it cannot give efficiency to them unless it is itself "efficient;" and it may be accepted as a fact that it will be no exception to previous laws, and cannot be enforced so long as it makes any exemption of those who observe another day. So the exemption will be allowed to remain only till the law is secured, and when the time comes to enforce it, the exemption will be repealed. That is the way it is done. Exemption clauses in Sunday laws are frauds. They are designed only to delude fair-minded persons into favoring the enactment of the law, and they never serve any other purpose. Let all lovers of justice pay no heed to the voice of the National Reform charmer, charm he never so wisely.*AMS June 5, 1889, page 150.4*

E. J. W.



## June 12, 1889

**“A Misleading Petition—Which One Is It?” American Sentinel 4, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the February number of *Our Day*, the magazine edited by Joseph Cook, in an editorial notice of the presentation of the Sunday-law petition to Congress, we find the following:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.1*

“The Seventh-day Adventists, whose chief aim in life seems to be to break down the American Sabbath, are circulating a misleading counter-petition, which gives the impression that it is the religious observance of the Sabbath which the great petition asks Congress to promote, whereas nothing is asked beyond protection of Sunday rest and public worship in the domain of the National Government, as has been afforded in nearly all the States from the beginning to citizens in the domain of State governments.”*AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.2*

About the same time Mr. Crafts published a circular letter in which he said:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.3*

“Prompt action on the petition is the more important from the fact that the enemies of the Sunday-Rest law, a curious combination of Saturdarians, saloonists, and a few papers, are becoming very active in the circulation of misrepresentations and misleading counter-petitions, the latter so worded as to give the false impression that we are asking for a law to promote the religious observance of the Sabbath, whereas our petition seeks only protection for Sunday rest and worship.”*AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.4*

Since so much is said about this counter-petition, it may be well to publish it, that all the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL may know what it does ask for. The petition reads as follows:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.5*

*“To the Honorable, the Senate of the United States—AMS June 12,*

"We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your Honorable Body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord's day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion; but that the total separation between religion and State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it." *AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.7*

Now we can compare the statements with the petition. Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say that this counter-petition is misleading, in that it gives the false impression that the Sunday-law people are asking for the promotion or protection of the religious observance of Sunday. But the most careful reader of the counter-petition will fail to find in it any reference whatever to the American Sunday Union, or to a petition for a Sunday law, or to the Blair bill, or to anything whatever that has been done. It simply asks that Congress shall not pass a bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or in regard to any other religious institution; nor to favor any amendment that would tend to give preference to any religion, or to any religious body, above another, but to keep Church and State entirely separate, as they were designed to be by the fathers of our country. In short, the sum of the petition is that Congress will not interfere in religious controversies, and in matters purely religious. Our Sunday-law friends claim that this is just what they want; they claim that they do not want religious legislation; they claim that they want Church and State kept entirely separate. Now if they are sincere in their protestations, why do they object so strongly to this counter-petition? Indeed, if they mean what they say when they deny the charge that they are laboring for a union of Church and State, and are so bitterly opposed to civil interference in matters purely religious, they ought to sign the petition. Indeed, they should be intensely anxious to sign it. If their protestations are of any value,

then this so-called counter-petition is not a counter-petition at all, but is exactly in harmony with their petition and their line of work, and they ought to adopt it. But they do not indorse it; they most bitterly denounce it. Then what shall we conclude? We can form no other conclusion than that they are not sincere when they say that they do not desire a union of Church and State; when they say that what their petition calls for is not religious legislation. It is the wounded bird that flutters. The hatred which they manifest to this petition, and their evident chagrin at the large number of signatures of the best people that have been secured for it, show that the petition strikes directly against their work. They show that the counter-petition asks Congress not to do the very thing that their petition desires it to do. And what is that? It asks them not to legislate upon the subject of religion, and not to do anything that tends to Church and State union. By opposing the petition which asks that this be not done they show that they want it done. In no other way could they so clearly show the real object of the Sunday-law petition, and the spirit of the Sunday-law movement, than by the bitter opposition which they make to this counter-petition. Their action in the matter stamps their movement as a movement to secure a union of Church and State, and nothing else. *AMS June 12, 1889, page 153.8*

Now we will have a little direct testimony concerning the matter of the religious observance of Sunday, which both Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts say they do not desire. We will quote once more a few statements which will show clearly just what they do want. We have given them many times, but we shall doubtless be compelled to repeat them many more times, for the Sunday people persist in telling the people generally another thing from what they talk among themselves. First, we repeat the statement made by Mrs. Bateham in her speech at the Washington Convention last summer. Referring to the petitions that hung around the assembly room, she said: —*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.1*

“As I look about this church to-night, I cannot help thinking of the fourteen million people that this meeting represents, all of whom are praying to have the holy day observed. They are praying that the Government will pass a law that will compel the people to observe the first day of the week; and people in every State of the Union are

distributing circulars to secure signatures to that effect.”*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.2*

This statement is taken from the report in the *Lutheran Observer* of December 21, 1888, whose editor, Dr. Conrad, was one of the speakers at the convention, and is one of the officers of the American Sunday Union. Nothing that we could say could more directly contradict the statement made by Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts than does this statement by Mrs. Bateham. They say that their petition does not ask for the religious observance of the day, but she says that the petitioners pray to have the holy day observed. Of course, we know that there were not fourteen million petitioners, and that the day is not holy; but her statement intimates that those who signed the petition intelligently did so with the understanding that it was a request to have the day observed as though it were holy. It is true that the petition itself does not say anything about religious observance; but Mrs. Bateham says that those who sign the petition thereby pray that the Government will pass a law to compel the people to observe the first day of the week. And the fact that she calls it a holy day shows that they sign the petition with the understanding that it is to secure the compulsory observance of Sunday as a holy day. Therefore, if Mr. Cook and Mr. Crafts are so righteously indignant because their petition has been, as they say, misrepresented and made to appear as though it called for the religious observance of Sunday, they should turn their guns upon Mrs. Bateham. Not an enemy to the Sunday-law petition or the Sunday-law movement has said a single thing beyond what Mrs. Bateham herself has said.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.3*

Again, in the report above referred to in the *Lutheran Observer*, we find the following statement made by Dr. Crafts. He said, “The bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritan, which day shall only be occupied by worship.” That bill was introduced by Senator Blair in response to the petition which has been referred to, which was gotten up by the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union. Yet Mr. Crafts says that they do not want anything like religious legislation, and that they don’t petition to have Sunday observed religiously.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.4*

Again, Mr. Crafts said in his address before the general assembly of

the Knights of Labor, reported in the *Journal of United Labor*, November 29, 1888, that “the weekly day of rest has never been secured in any land, except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out and you take the rest out.” *AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.5*

Col. Elliott F. Shepard is president of the American Sunday Union. The New York Mail and Express of January 25, 1889, gives in full his address before the convention upon his election as president of the Union. In that address, he spoke of the petition as follows: —*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.6*

“We have already been told that there are upon this petition for a National Sunday-Rest law some six millions of Protestants, and some seven millions of Romanists. The Romanists are supposed to be represented by that one signature-of Cardinal Gibbons-which was obtained with much less trouble than the greater part of the Protestants in our country. We have some six millions already on the petition, so that we have a basis to work upon; but there are still fifty-two millions of Protestants whom we must interest in this movement. We must go on; we must bring them to sign the petition for the Sabbath. We are very glad to welcome as a coadjutor the Roman Catholic Church in any branch of Christianity, or in any form of benevolent work in which it will consent to join us; but we must not forget the greater number of the population outside of that church, and we are bound to prosecute this work until we lay its binding truths of divine authority before the whole people, and bring them all into the valley of decision. Choose this day whom ye will serve; if the Lord be God, serve him; and if the world be God, serve that. You have to say yes or no-whether you will stand by the decalogue, whether you will stand by the Lord God Almighty, or whether you will turn your back upon him. The work, therefore, of this society has just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning-for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment.” *AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.7*

Now this shows that their petition is the one that is misleading. It shows that they expect to gain a great deal more than appears on the face of their petition; it shows that they have worded their

petition just so as to secure the greatest number of signatures to it. They are multiplying signatures by every means, both fair and foul—principally foul—counting in its favor thousands of people who never heard of it, as well as other thousands who have heard of it, but who know really nothing as to its real design; and then they intend to wheel these petitioners into line, as favoring their construction of the petition, and demanding a law to compel people to observe Sunday as a holy day.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.8*

We might give other quotations from the leaders in the Sunday movement, but these are sufficient. We are not dealing in conjectures, but we give the statements as they appear in black and white, upon the authority of the leaders of the Sunday-law workers themselves. If anything in our language seems to be harsh, we leave it to the candid reader to decide if it is not just. We make no scruple in charging bad faith upon the leaders in this Sunday-law movement, because we condemn them only out of their own mouths; but in so doing we wish to make no reflections upon these men as individuals. We have no doubt that personally they are very pleasant men, and that under almost any other circumstance they would reason logically and act fairly. We attribute their course, not to any inherent wickedness in themselves but to the force of circumstances. They have committed themselves to the securing of an iniquitous law, and such a law can be secured only by iniquitous methods. Religious legislation by civil Governments has always been marked by fraud and a disregard for the rights of dissenters; and when these men give themselves to such unrighteous work they can do no other than what they are doing. We pity them, and hope that some of them, at least, may see the error of their way and turn from it.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 154.9*

E. J. W.

**“Mr. Crafts against Facts” American Sentinel 4, 20.**

E. J. Waggoner

We have before us a copy of the Vineland (N. J.) *Evening Journal*, of April 19, which contains a report of an address on the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, delivered in that place by Doctor Crafts. From that

report we make the following brief quotations, that we may compare them with the facts:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 155.1*

The Blair bill, said he, is not what its enemies would have it. Blair drew this bill for the Sabbath men the same as any lawyer would draw bills for any client. Blair has drawn bills for another sect who are opposed in some degree to the American Sabbath, or a day of rest. The two bills are put together by enemies of the Rest bill, and thus misrepresentations are made. When Blair drew the original bill he used his own language, and the bill read ‘promote’ Sabbath observance instead of ‘protect.’ Enemies took the word ‘promote’ as an effort to get God in the Constitution and establish State religions—that is, religions supported and maintained by the State.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 155.2*

“The friends of the bill never had any desire to ‘promote’ Sabbath observance, and therefore that word was stricken out and ‘protect’ inserted, and this was done immediately, but the enemy still delights in informing the people that ‘promote’ is the word. Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the W. C. T. U. was at the head of the move. The movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitudes, and that in these days of soulless corporations and combinations, it was necessary that law should stand between the ‘spoiler’ and the employees. When P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw a need of a day of rest for the workingmen. Now labor organizations are taking the matter up and will carry reform out. Understand that ‘religious observance’ nor the ‘word of God’ are not mentioned in the bill, and are no part of it. The ‘Rest bill’ is for the benefit of the masses and the health of the people. The bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop.”*AMS June 12, 1889, page 155.3*

We know nothing of a bill that Mr. Blair has drawn for a sect that is opposed to the American Sabbath or to a day of rest. Indeed, we do not know of any sect in the United States that is opposed to a day of rest; but whatever other bills Mr. Blair may have drawn up, the enemies of the Sunday-Rest bill have not put together nor confounded it with any other. All our strictures have been made upon the Sunday-Rest bill, without any regard to any other bill. Further, Mr. Blair did not draw up the Sunday-Rest bill just as a lawyer would draw up any bill, but has shown himself intensely partisan in pushing the bill. In the notice which the April number of *Our Day* gives to the hearing on the Rest bill, we find this sentence: "We subjoin from its pages some of the dialogues between Senator Blair (who showed himself matchless in cross-questioning) and the opponents of the bill." This states the case exactly, as the reader of that hearing will see. Mr. Blair did act the part of a paid attorney, cross-questioning and arguing with the opponents of the bill, but assisting those that were praying for its passage. This may be set down as one instance where Mr. Crafts unfortunately differs with facts.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 155.4*

Again, concerning the relative importance of the words "promote" and "protect." It is not true, as Mr. Crafts states, that "the enemy still delights in informing the people that 'promote' is the word." It is a matter of fact that the bill was not amended, now was any substitute introduced during the session of Congress. All there is to it is this: The American Sabbath Union, at its meeting in Washington last December, saw that the statement that the bill was designed to promote the observance of Sunday as a day of religious worship, showed too plainly upon its face that it was an act to establish a State religion. Accordingly they appointed a committee to formulate changes they desired in the bill. This committee reported; and among other things was the substitution of the word "protect" for "promote" in the preamble and last clause of the bill. These changes we immediately noted, publishing the original bill side by side with the bill as the Union desired it to read; we have printed it more than once, and have repeatedly referred to the change from "promote" to "protect;" although, as it has been said before, the bill which was introduced into Congress read, "to promote its (the first day) observance as a day of religious worship," until the bill died a natural death by the adjournment of Congress.*AMS June 12, 1889,*



What Mr. Crafts objects to, however, is the fact that we have showed that the word “protect” does not conceal the object of the bill any more than did the word “promote.” We have shown again and again that so far as the people who observe Sunday are concerned, they do not need any more protection than they already have. There is abundant provision in the laws of every State for the protection of religious worship. And the bill which Mr. Blair introduced does not say that it is desired that the people shall be protected, but that the religious observance of the day shall be protected; and that can mean nothing else but that all the people shall be prohibited from using the day in any other way than as a day of religious worship.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.1*

And this is just what Mr. Crafts himself has said that they desire to secure by the passage of the bill. In the Washington Convention he declared that “the bill which has been introduced makes Sunday the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans, which day shall be occupied only by worship.” So here we have No. 2 of Mr. Crafts’s unfortunate collisions with facts.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.2*

Again, the report says that “Dr. Crafts gave a history of how the movement for Sabbath observance first started, and denied, as has been charged, that the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union was at the head of the movement.” Unfortunately for Mr. Crafts, we have something upon this point also. In the Union Signal of May 3, 1888, there appeared a report of a hearing which the Senate Committee on Education and Labor gave on the 6th of the preceding month to the friends of a Sunday law. Mrs. J. C. Bateham, the superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, presented the opening paper, and was followed by several ministers. The Union Signal, to which we just referred, said: “Senator Blair will now draft and present a bill for us.” This shows that the bill was introduced at the request of the Woman’s Christian Temperance Union.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.3*

Again, in the hearing before the committee on Education and Labor, on Thursday, December 13, 1888, Mrs. Bateham, in replying to a question by Mr. Blair, said: “This petition work has been done

chiefly by our Woman's Christian Temperance Union. The ministry, I may say, have had almost nothing to do with it. It was started in behalf of the elevation of the masses to protect the morality of the people." This is sufficient on that point.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.4*

Mr. Crafts says that the movement was started, not as a religious measure at all, but because some people saw that it was necessary to have a day of rest for the health of the multitude. Again he says: "Understand that 'religious observance' nor the 'word of God' are not mentioned in the bill and are no part of it. The Rest bill is for the benefit of the masses, and the health of the people." Mr. Crafts may presume upon the ignorance of the people to whom he lectures, but he ought to take some precaution to keep his lectures from getting into print, where they can be seen by those who are familiar with the Blair bill. With his statement that religious observance is not mentioned in the bill, and is no part of it, compare the preamble of the bill. We quote it with the changes desired by the American Sabbath Union, so that Mr. Crafts can find no fault with it. It reads as follows:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.5*

"A bill to secure to the people the enjoyment of the Lord's day, commonly known as Sunday, as a day of rest, and to protect its observance as a day of religious worship."*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.6*

Now it is technically true that the term "religious observance" does not occur in this preamble; that is, the words do not occur in just that relation; but nevertheless it is plainly declared that the bill is to protect the religious observance of the day. But this is not all; the bill itself closes with the statement that "the act shall be construed so far as possible to secure to the whole people rest from toil during Sunday, their mental and moral culture, and *the protection of the religious observance of the day.*" Yet in the face of this Mr. Crafts wishes us to understand that "religious observance" is not mentioned in the bill and is no part of it! The reader cats draw his own conclusions as to the design of Mr. Crafts in making that statement.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.7*

Again he says that "when P. M. Arthur, the head of the Locomotive

Engineers, and T. V. Powderly, the head of the Knights of Labor, each representing thousands of signatures, signed the petition for this Sunday-Rest bill, it was plain that they saw the need of a day of rest for the workingmen.” Mr. Crafts is here trying to substantiate his assertions that this Sunday movement was originated solely by the workingmen and not by the churches. But it is about as nefarious a statement as the other; for, as a matter of fact, Mr. Powderly and Mr. Arthur did not indorse the petition in behalf of the thousands who had never seen it, until Mr. Crafts had labored with them for several hours, overcoming their objections. And further than this, the Union Signal, referring to the vote passed by the General Assembly of the Knights of Labor after Mr. Crafts had argued and pleaded with them, said that it was a wonderful victory achieved by Mr. Crafts. It could not have been very much of a victory to secure the signatures of those workingmen, if the workingmen had instituted the movement. There seems to be a little discrepancy here which we will leave to Mr. Crafts to explain.*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.8*

Once more, Mr. Crafts says that the bill does not deny the right to work to any citizen in the United States, on any day of the week, provided that citizen does not engage in trade, where there is competition, so that his neighbor is compelled to keep open his shop. If we had the space we would reprint the bill in full; but those who have files of the AMERICAN SENTINEL can find it, and can verify our statement that the bill specifies nothing of the kind. We will quote enough to show that it does deny the right of any person subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States to work on Sunday, even if he is not engaged in trade, and if there is no competition. Section 1 of the bill (and let it be understood that we are quoting from the bill as amended by the American Sabbath Union) reads as follows:—*AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.9*

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person or corporation, or the agent, servant, or employe of any person or corporation, shall perform or authorize to be performed any secular work, labor, or business to the disturbance of others, works of necessity, mercy, and humanity excepted; nor shall any person engage in any play, games or amusement, or recreation, to the*

disturbance of others on the first day of the week, commonly known as the Lord's day, or during any part thereof, is any Territory, district, vessel, or place subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States; nor shall it be lawful for any person or corporation to receive pay for labor or service performed or rendered in violation of this section." *AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.10*

We advise Mr. Crafts to study the Sunday bill a little more thoroughly before he lectures again. We might dwell at length upon the last statement quoted by Mr. Crafts in regard to competition, but if we merely call attention to it it will be sufficient in this place to let the reader see that if his statement were true it would show that the Sunday movement was simply a part of a gigantic monopoly, that if carried out would eclipse anything that has ever been known. All that we designed to do in this article was to call attention to the almost constant collisions between the statements of the leaders in the Sunday-law movement and the truth. It can truly be said of them that they are not afraid of the truth, for they meet it in conflict nearly every day. *AMS June 12, 1889, page 156.11*

E. J. W.

## June 19, 1889

“Christopher Ephraim’s Tottering Morality” *American Sentinel* 4, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

Someone has favored us with a copy of the *Home Record*, a paper published at Leavenworth, Kansas, which contains an article that shows very clearly the spirit that actuates some of those who are zealous for a Sunday law. The article in question is by Mrs. H. F. Hartough. It purports to be the experience of an old lady with a young lady who was circulating the protest against religious legislation. After a little introductory gossip about her son, Christopher Ephraim, who was a little wild, the old lady describes the visit of the young lady and her introduction of her business, and finally asks what the petition is. The story then proceeds in the old lady’s language, as follows:—*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.1*

“‘It is against establishing a religion in this country,’ says she, ‘that will make a man keep a proscribed Sabbath-day, or believe in things he cannot believe in. It is against recognizing God in the Constitution.’” *AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.2*

“That Sabbath business made me think of Christopher E. How he went to base-ball games and races on Sundays in summer-time, and hunting in winter time, an’ it wasn’t doing him any good. So I says, says I, ‘I’m in favor of getting more of God an’ the Sabbath in our Constitution! It won’t hurt our systems one bit. Now, my Christopher Ephraim is lettin’ all the Sabbath get out of his constitution, an’ he’s failin’, morally. His foundation is totterin’, an’ he’ll fall, sure as fate, if there ain’t something done. I want a law passed,’ says I, ‘that’ll compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep ‘em from killin’ folks.’” *AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.3*

“‘Whether they believe in it or not, eh?’ says she, sneerin’.” *AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.4*

“‘Certainly,’ says I. ‘If a man believes in killin’ would you let him murder your family, ma’am?’” *AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.5*

“That’s quite a different matter,’ says she.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.6*

“No, ‘tain’t,’ says I, getting warm. ‘One’s just as right as the Pother. It’s no more right for my son to go to base-ball games on Sundays, an’ horse-races, an’ all such, than it is for him to steal or kill. No, ma’am; I want a Sunday law an’ want it enforced, an’ if somebody or other don’t believe in keepin’ the law let ‘em go where there ain’t none. We don’t want ‘em here.’*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.7*

“She looked at me as if she felt sorry for me. She actually did. But I didn’t mind her looks. I was thinking about Christopher E., and how he was doomed to destruction if these things wa’n’t put a stop to, an’ I just went on: ‘This land’s getting too free,’ says I, getting up and resumin’ my dustin’. ‘We’ve put the Bible out of the public school for fear of hurtin’ somebody’s feelings; we’ve let the base-balls run for fear the workingmen wouldn’t get exercise enough, an’ now them freedom-lovin’ folks want us to give up our Sunday. Pretty soon they’ll come sneaking ‘round an’ petition Congress to compel the preachers to hunt texts out of the daily papers or the magazines instead of the Bible, for fear o’ hurtin’ their feelings. They ain’t patriots, they’re heathen infidels, an’ the quicker we send ‘em out o’ this land the freer we’ll be.’”*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.8*

This little story was of course written with an object, and that object was to prejudice people against those who oppose Sunday legislation and Church and State union. We propose to give a brief review of the portion which we have just copied, with the object of showing the real purpose of these Sunday workers.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.9*

The first point that we notice is the idea that religious legislation will make men good. The old lady gives as a reason why she is in favor of recognizing God in the Constitution, that her Christopher Ephraim is “lettin’ all the Sabbath out of his constitution, an’ he’s failin’, morally. His foundation is a totterin’, an’ he’ll fall, sure as fate, if there ain’t something done.” The idea seems to have obtained a firm foothold that men can be made moral by law; but there is not a law in the universe that can make man moral or religious. The moral law does not make man moral, and will not prop up a “tottering”

morality. God's own righteous law cannot make men righteous. The ten commandments only point out the unrighteousness of men, and drive them to Christ, whose righteousness may be imputed to them, and who, through their faith in him, will enable them to fulfill the righteousness of the law.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.10*

When people talk about propping up tottering morality by civil enactments, they show their ignorance of what morality is. Does the writer of that story imagine that the enactment of the Sunday law, and the recognition of God in the Constitution, will keep man from falling?—It seems so, and that is a regular National Reform idea; for in the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M. Johnston tells of the time when Christ's "gospel will prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law." In a speech in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, reported in the *Christian Statesman* of November 6, of the same year, M. A. Gault said:—*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.11*

"This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was taken as a standard of religion, and if public sentiment were lifted up to that standard, it would do away with stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society. So we do not flatter ourselves when we say that the glorious millennial day will be ushered in by the triumph of this movement."*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.12*

This shows just how much knowledge these National Reformers have of what sin is. They are going to suppress Sabbath-breaking, murder, licentiousness, etc., by law; but the truth is that very often the most vicious are those of whom the law cannot take any notice, because their viciousness is concealed in their own hearts. When a man commits a murder, the law can punish him, but it cannot prevent him from committing the murder. For instance, here is a man that has received some injury at the hands of another. He broods over the wrong, and cherishes anger and hatred until his revengeful feelings assume entire control of him, and he resolves to murder the object of his hatred. He fixes on the time when he will carry his murderous designs into effect, secretes himself at the

place where he expects the man to pass, has his knife all in readiness to give the fatal blow, but his intended victim passes by another way where he cannot reach him without exposing himself, and so his plan is frustrated. Is he any less a murderer than though he had carried his design into effect? If he should die that moment, would God hold him any less guiltless than though he had killed the man? No; for the Bible declares that whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer. Yet not another soul on earth has known of this man's murderous intentions. Then how would it be possible to suppress murder by law?*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.13*

Take the case of Sabbath-breaking. It is not simply the abstaining from labor on that day that constitutes Sabbath-keeping. Through the prophet Isaiah, the Lord says that to honor him by keeping his Sabbath, men must not do their own ways nor find their own pleasure, nor speak their own words. Now the minions of the Inquisition cannot keep such persistent watch over men as to know every word they speak, and does anyone suppose that the thoughts can be prevented from running riot even in the house of worship?*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.14*

Take the matter of licentiousness. The law punishes the adulterer and the seducer, but it cannot prevent licentiousness. Here is a man whose very soul is rotten with iniquity. He cherishes lustful desires toward someone of the opposite sex, and his whole thought is how he can accomplish his design. He thinks of it by day, and dreams of it by night. He lives in an atmosphere of impurity, and is wholly corrupt. In imagination he again and again accomplishes his desires; but something happens to prevent the overt act, and nobody but himself knows his evil purpose. Yet, according to the Bible, he is as guilty as though the act had actually been committed. The Saviour said that he who looks upon a woman with lust, has already committed adultery. But law cannot prohibit lust. Even the agents of the Inquisition cannot fathom a man's thoughts and read his corrupt desires.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 163.15*

So it is utter folly to speak of suppressing immorality by law. It is not only folly but it is wicked, for it leads to an establishment of a false standard of morality. When men talk of putting down immorality by law, they thereby say that the outward observance of the law, which



is all that can be secured, is all that constitutes morality. Therefore they deceive the man who is outwardly correct in deportment but abominably corrupt in heart, into the belief that he is an upright man.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 164.1*

The writer of the article under consideration makes the old lady say: "I want a law passed that will compel people to keep the Sabbath-day just as much as to keep them from killing folks." Now granting that it is just as wicked to break the Sabbath as it is to murder, it does not follow that there should be a civil law against Sabbath-breaking, just as to punish murder. The two things are entirely dissimilar. A man may break the Sabbath, and do no injury to any person besides himself. He does not interfere with the inalienable right of any individual to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, as he does when he commits murder. He does not by his act compel anybody else to do wrong. His act begins and ends with himself; therefore the Government cannot rightfully take any notice of it.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 164.2*

But says one, What about the hilarious, boisterous Sunday picnics, in which drunken hoodlums annoy people, disturb worship, and endanger or destroy property?—Why, deal with them just as you would on any other day of the week. The same law that arrests the drunken hoodlum for making a nuisance of himself on Monday will do it on Sunday. The old lady in the story said that her Christopher was doomed to destruction if Sunday labor and amusements were not stopped. This again shows the National Reform theory that the people of the country are to be saved by law. The State is to take the place of the church, and men are to be swept into the kingdom of Heaven by wholesale, whether they will or no. The gospel knows nothing of such methods of salvation.*AMS June 19, 1889, page 164.3*

Only one point more need take our attention. That is the intolerance of religious legislation. Says the old lady: "I want a Sunday law and want it enforced, and if somebody or other don't believe in keeping the law; let them go where there ain't none. We do not want them here." And again, "The quicker we send them out of this land, the freer we shall be." These statements stamp this Sunday-law movement as being the very essence of National Reform, for the

readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL have often read the statement made by Mr. Graham, one of the vice-presidents of the National Reform Association, to the effect that if the enemies of their movement did not like it they could go to some barren land, and in the name of the devil and for the sake of the devil, stay there till they die. Now notice where this false zeal for religion will lead these people to. First, they must Christianize the country by law. Those who do not like the law and do not wish to be Christianized after their methods can leave the country. But some other country to which they might go will be fired with the same kind of zeal, and so will refuse to receive them. Thus we may imagine them wandering from country to country only to find that all are zealous for the same sort of millennium, and that the people are getting so good that they will not tolerate anyone who they think is bad, and that will be the one who does not think as they do. Then what?—Why, then the only thing to do with these persistent heretics, who refuse to be Christianized according to the National Reform idea, will be to put them to death. There will be no room for them on the earth. This was the conclusion that was reached in the days of the Papal supremacy. And if National Reform, which is the image of the Papacy, shall ever be carried to its finality, it will result again. The spirit of so-called National Reform from Sunday legislation to the end of the chapter is the spirit of intolerance and persecution. *AMS June 19, 1889, page 164.4*

E. J. W.

## June 26, 1889

**“Who Are the Friends of the Bible?” American Sentinel 4, 22.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Congregationalist* of February 7 contained an editorial entitled “Unsectarian Morality,” in which it says:—*AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.1*

“The *Christian Register* published last week the replies of thirty-five eminent men and women, many of whom are practical educators, to the questions whether morality can be taught in our public schools without sectarianism, and what suggestions they had to offer as to methods and influences. As, naturally, they look at the subject from widely different points of view, their replies vary considerably in detail. It is the more gratifying, therefore, to notice that most of them answer the first question heartily in the affirmative. Of course the five Roman Catholics claim that morality cannot be taught, in any sense satisfactory to them, without including the inculcation of the principles of Roman Catholicism; and there are one or two others who reply negatively.”*AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.2*

This is in line with the ideas expressed by Senator Blair in his speech in the Senate, December 21, on the occasion of referring his proposed religious amendment to the Committee on Education and Labor. Said he:—*AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.3*

“In regard to the general principles of the Christian religion, no one but a bigot would think of having introduced into the public schools instruction in favor of any form of sectarianism; but a knowledge of the Christian religion, even if there be no enforcement of those truths upon the conviction and belief of the child, instruction in those principles, a statement or explanation of what they are, exactly as instruction is given in the principles of arithmetic and geography and any of the common branches of science, is exceedingly desirable and important for every citizen of this country to possess, whether he applies the principles in his personal conduct or not.”*AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.4*

No one can talk that way who has any just idea of the Scriptures—their nature and object. Such talk can come only from those who can see no more in the Bible than they do in an ordinary text-book on science; just as the carrying out of Mr. Blair's proposed amendment would result in lowering the Bible, in the minds of the people, to the level of text-books on arithmetic and geography. *AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.5*

In contrast with the statements of those who imagine that the Bible can be studied with profit in the same way that history and geography are studied, let us place the statement of a man who knows what the Bible is, and what it is for. In the *Old Testament Student* of February, 1889, the editor, Prof: William R. Harper, of Yale University, writes as follows:—*AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.6*

"The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature. This statement may appear startling; but it is true. The Old Testament is not Hebrew literature in the sense that the Iliad and the Greek Drama are Greek literature; or the Book of the Dead, Egyptian; or the Zend Avesta, Persian. If one desires simple Hebrew literature, the product of the Jewish mind, he will find it in the Talmud, Targums, and other rabbinical writings. The writers of the Old Testament were more than mere Hebrews. Moses, David, and Isaiah did not simply reflect national thought and feeling. They were inspired, were men to whom divine thought and feeling were revealed. When we speak of the study of the Old Testament as literature, we mean, then, the study of the national dress and outward adornment of a body of divine truth. Such study is profitable and interesting, and very important. But is it insignificant when compared with the study of the doctrine which this outward national dress contains? Renan has made a special study of the Hebrew Scripture from the point of view that they are a national literature, and with what result? The divine truth has made so little impression upon him that he can write a play, 'the story of which, of a man's debauchery the day before the guillotine, is as correct as can well be conceived, and its leading thought is that passions must run their course even if death stands at the door.' Such debasing thought and philosophy may thus co-exist with the highest appreciation of the Bible as a literature. Turn now from Renan to those who have studied these sacred writings to

find therein the voice of God speaking of sin, justice, and mercy; and how great the contrast! Here belong such men as Luther, Calvin, Latimer, Knox, Wesley, together with the great rank and file of earnest Christian workers and believers. The Old Testament is not the history of men's thoughts about God, or desires after God, or affections toward him. It professes to be a history of God's unveiling of himself to men. If it is not that, it is nothing; it is false from beginning to end. To make it the history of the speculation of a certain tribe about God, we must deny the very root of any speculations which that tribe ever had. For this root is the belief that they could not think of him unless he had first thought of them; that they could not speak of him unless he were speaking of them." *AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.7*

"In the modern revival of biblical study there is a danger that the Scripture by some may be studied only after the manner of Renan, or too exclusively as a national literature." *AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.8*

Dr. Harper is not ignorant of the literary beauty of the Bible, as anyone who is acquainted with him can testify; but he sees the danger of studying it with that sole object. As a matter of fact, it cannot be taught according to Mr. Blair's ideas—except by avowed infidels, which of course would never be thought of, and if it were, the result would necessarily be to make infidels. No man who has any regard for the Bible as the word of God, can teach it without conforming his teaching to his own religious views; and if this were done in the public schools, confusion and religious strife would inevitably follow. How can the danger be averted?—Only by keeping the Bible out of State schools, and leaving instruction in it to the family, the church, and the private or denominational school. *AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.9*

They are not true friends of the Bible who are clamoring for its introduction into the public schools. They may be sincere in their motives, but they would give the sacred Book the worst blow it has ever received. The friends of the Bible are those who wish it studied for just what it is—the revelation of God's will to man—the guide to holiness and eternal life. *AMS June 26, 1889, page 170.10*

E. J. W.

## July 3, 1889

**“Editor Shepard and the Baptist Clergymen” American Sentinel 4, 23.**

E. J. Waggoner

On the 22nd of April, Mr. Shepard, editor of the New York *Mail and Express*, and president of the American Sabbath Union, addressed the Baptist Ministerial Association of Philadelphia upon the subject of “The Observance of the Sabbath.” The Philadelphia Bulletin of that date gives a brief notice of his address, from which we clip the following:—*AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.1*

“He spoke without notes, and began by saying that it was owing to his Baptist grandmother that he was not known as Jack Shepard, and that when he goes to the city of brotherly love he always remembers that his mother is a Quaker; and continuing said it would be affectation to think that he could say anything new to an assembly of Baptist clergymen. The blessing in the book of Genesis is not for a seventh day but for the Sabbath. We should take the spirit of the commandment, and take one-seventh part of time and devote it to God. As the majority of Christians have taken the first day of the week it is better that we too should observe it.”*AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.2*

It would indeed seem to be affectation for Mr. Shepard to think he could instruct an assembly of Baptist clergymen. On first thought we should call it presumption, or great self-conceit; but inasmuch as the Baptist clergymen listened quietly to his instruction, doubtless they thought it profitable. Whether it was presumption or not, it is certainly strange that an editor of a secular newspaper should be able to instruct a party of Baptist clergymen in theology. It either speaks a great deal for the editor or very little for the clergymen.*AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.3*

When we read his statement that the blessing in the book of Genesis is not for the seventh day, but, for the Sabbath, we are fully assured that even if he could not say anything new to the assembly of Baptist clergymen, he could say something that was not true. Doubtless Mr. Shepard has read in the book of Genesis the account

of the blessing to which he referred. If he had, then he must have known that what he said was not true. We will quote it: "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." *Genesis 2:3*. Mr. Shepard says that the blessing was not for the seventh day. The Scripture says that the blessing was for the seventh day. Moreover, the pronouns in the verse refer to the definite day, the seventh day, the day in which God rested. By no possible construction could it be made to appear that this blessing is for the Sabbath institution and not for a definite day. The preceding verse says that God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. Now the day was not the Sabbath until God had rested, because Sabbath means rest. It was his resting on that day that made it a Sabbath. It was his blessing it and his hallowing it that made it the holy Sabbath. But it was the seventh day in which he rested; and he blessed it-the seventh day-and sanctified it-the seventh day-because that in it he had rested. Will Mr. Shepard say that God did not rest on the seventh day, but only on the Sabbath? He cannot without denying the plainest declaration of Scripture; but the statement that God rested on the seventh day is no plainer than the statement that he blessed that day. *AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.4*

Mr. Shepard says that we should take the spirit of the commandment, and take one-seventh part of time and devote it to God. Now it is susceptible of the clearest proof that the spirit of the commandment, as well as the letter, has no reference to simply one-seventh part of time, but to a definite seventh day. But we will let that pass, and take Mr. Shepard's version of the commandment, namely, that it requires one-seventh part of time, leaving the specific day to the choice of the individual. In a speech made by Mr. Shepard at the National Sunday Convention, last December, he implied that they intended to re-enact the fourth commandment. In speeches since that time, and in articles, he and other leaders in the Sunday-law movement have claimed that they wanted the law in harmony with the fourth commandment. Now if he really believes that the spirit of the commandment requires simply one-seventh part of man's time, and does not specify the particular day, why does he labor so zealously for a law to compel people to keep one particular day of the week—the first day? Does he not by his own



statement convict himself of laboring for something that is contrary to the Bible?—He certainly does. He claims that he wants this Government to be Christian, to be in harmony with the Bible; and yet he is laboring to have it pass laws which are directly contrary to what he himself says the Bible teaches. We should be glad to see how he can absolve himself from the charge of gross inconsistency.*AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.5*

Seventh-day Baptists and Seventh-day Adventists claim that the fourth commandment is very definite, and that by it the Lord. requires the observance of the seventh day of the week, and no other. Mr. Shepard and many of his under-shepherds deny this. They cannot make the claim for Sunday that seventh-day people do for Saturday, because they well know that the fourth commandment makes no reference whatever to the first day of the week. In order, however, to make it appear that they comply with the fourth commandment, they adopt the theory that it calls for the observance of simply a seventh part of time; but they ought to be able to see that such a theory does not help them any as against seventh-day observers. Saturday is one-seventh part of time just as much as Sunday is. Therefore, if they propose to legislate in harmony with the fourth commandment, and they say that that commandment requires simply the observance of a seventh part of time, without specifying which day, they stultify themselves whenever they attempt to enforce their definite Sunday law upon seventh-day people.*AMS July 3, 1889, page 177.6*

We have a stronger charge yet to bring against them. Out of their own mouth we will convict them of doing the very thing which the apostle Paul charges upon the “man of sin” in *2 Thessalonians 2:4*. They say that God has not specified the exact day that is to be observed, but that he simply requires an indefinite seventh part of time, and they propose to go beyond him and require all men to observe the same time, and they specify the first day of the week. Now if they believe the theory which they put forth concerning the commandment, then they are exalting themselves above God. They say that God left the commandment indefinite. Now if that is so he must have had a reason for it. What reason have they to say that his reason is not a good one? What right have they to attempt an improvement upon his commandment? They must stand convicted

of the grossest presumption. We would advise them not to meddle with the affairs of God, but to leave his commandment as he left it.*AMS July 3, 1889, page 178.1*

“As the majority of Christians have taken the first day of the week, it is better that we all should observe it,” says Mr. Shepard. Who are the “we” to whom he refers? He cannot include all creation in that word. He was speaking to a company who already observe the first day of the week. Of course if they think it is better for them to observe the first day, they are at perfect liberty to do so. But that does not prove anything in regard to those who do not think it is better to observe the first day of the week. His theory of the fourth commandment leaves every-one to choose his own time, only so he is sure to take a seventh; and his statement that it is better to observe the first day because the majority of Christians observe that day, shows that he does not pretend to have any authority for the observance of Sunday other than custom; and yet he proposes to three others to follow his custom, for which he acknowledges that he has no authority. What more than this is needed to show that this Sunday-law movement has its origin in selfish bigotry and the spirit of Papal assumption?*AMS July 3, 1889, page 178.2*

E. J. W.

## July 17, 1889

**“Mr. Crafts and the Petitioners Again” American Sentinel 4, 25.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, Mr. Crafts has a long article concerning the petitions against a National Sunday law. We have already noticed at some length, in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, the statements that Mr. Crafts has made in his speeches, but inasmuch as he keeps reiterating them, we can do no less than follow him up. He says of the counter-petition that it “would be unworthy of the attention of the religious press, but for the fact that in many cases it has deceived the very elect.” We wish to notice first his charge of deception. The petition which he says deceives the people, reads as follows:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.1*

“We, the undersigned, adult residents of the United States, 21 years of age or more, hereby respectfully, but earnestly, petition your honorable body not to pass any bill in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, or Lord’s day, or any other religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite; nor to favor in any way the adoption of any resolution for the Amendment of the National Constitution that would in any way tend, either directly or indirectly, to give preference to the principles of any religion, or of any religious body above another, or that will in any way sanction legislation upon the subject of religion, but that the total separation between religion and State, assured by the National Constitution as it now is, may forever remain as our fathers established it.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.2*

We cannot see what there is about this that would deceive anybody. All there is to it is stated plainly on the face of it. It asks nothing more nor less than that Congress shall not enact any Sunday laws, nor indulge in any kind of religious legislation, nor favor any amendment of the Constitution that would in any way discriminate in matters of religion. Those who are opposed to such legislation, and who believe that it will work disastrously, sign the petition. Those who want religious legislation, and who favor action tending toward a union of Church and State, are naturally opposed

to the petition. That is all there is to it. But Mr. Crafts says:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.3*

“The counter-petition is not technically a falsehood, but it is certainly calculated to give the false impression that the petition which millions of us have been urging before the National Congress, includes a proposition to enforce Sabbath observance as a religious or ecclesiastical institution or rite, and also a proposition to weaken the present guarantees of our Constitution against a union of Church and State.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.4*

But the counter-petition makes no reference whatever to the petition which Mr. Crafts is circulating. It says nothing about it. It does not even imply that such a petition is being circulated. It makes no reference to any action that has been taken or that is being taken. It simply asks Congress not to do a certain thing. It asks Congress to secure the maintenance of the separation between religion and the State just as it was provided by the men who framed the Constitution. Mr. Crafts thinks that this is aimed at his petition. If that is what he is working for; then this counter-petition is against it; but if he is op-posed to a union of Church and State, as he would have us believe, then the petition does not affect him or his work in the least.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.5*

But it will be urged that the petition requests Congress not to pass any law in favor of the Lord's day; and Mr. Crafts says that it conveys the false impression that the American Sabbath Union includes a proposition to enforce Sabbath observance as a religious ordinance. But the Sabbath is solely a religious ordinance, and if Sabbath observance be enjoined, it cannot be enjoined in any other way than as a religious ordinance; and Mr. Crafts said so in his speech before the general assembly of the Knights of Labor, which we have referred to many times. He stated that Sunday rest could not be secured except on the basis of moral obligation. The Rev. Dr. Sunderland, who is one of the leading spirits in this Sunday crusade, says that it is simply impossible to have merely a civil Sunday without the religious features.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.6*

Dr. Herrick Johnson, who is another leader in the movement, says

that to base the Sabbath, meaning of course Sunday laws, on mere human expediency is to base it on sand, and that while it may be proper to use the argument of expediency in influencing a certain class of men, it can never be permanently kept on such a basis, and that the anchorage of this movement is in the divine nature of the institution. And Mr. Shepard, the president of the Sunday Association, says that the only object of the organization should be to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship, and that laws framed to protect the weekly rest-day will fail to accomplish their full purpose when denied this moral basis. Therefore, from the admissions of the advocates of the Sunday law, the passage of the law would be to unite religion and the State. So that although the counter-petition mentions in particular laws in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, it may truly be said that the only thing that the counter-petition protests against, is the union of Church and State. So then, it would not be misleading in the least, if it positively declared that the Sunday law petition is a movement for the union of Church and State.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.7*

Here is a simple proposition that we will re-state. The counter-petition protests against a movement looking toward a union of Church and State. Mr. Crafts and his fellows say that they are strenuously opposed to any union of Church and State. Then they ought to be in favor of this petition. But the fact that they themselves call it a counter-petition shows that they regard it as directly opposed to their petition; and the fact that they themselves are bitterly opposed to this petition against a union of Church and State, shows that they themselves are strenuously working for that very thing.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 193.8*

Mr. Crafts says that his petition "simply asks a law to protect the people in their right to a weekly day of rest, without requiring of anyone a religious observance of the day, and without hindering those who observe another day from either worshiping on that day, or working on the first day of the week-unless the work be of such a nature, shop-keeping for instance, as will interfere with the general rest."*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.1*

Now, we ask, what necessity is there to ask for a law to protect the

people in their right to a weekly day of rest? Who is attempting to deprive them of it? Who could deprive them of it if the attempt were made? Who can stop people from keeping a weekly rest-day if they want to keep it? These questions answer themselves. There is no law in the country to hinder anybody from resting on Sunday if he wants to, and there are very strict laws to preserve to the people their liberty to rest undisturbed. Can the ministers keep the rest-day?—Certainly. It has never been claimed that their right to worship undisturbed has been interfered with. Can the people rest on the Sunday? They can if they want to. Then in what does the desired protection consist? Simply in forcing those to observe it who do not want to keep it. That is all. But this is an unchristian act, in that it is doing to others what the doers would protest against if tried upon them, and also in that it can result in nothing else but the manufacture of infidels. It will have this result in two ways. First, by disgusting people by such unchristian methods carried on under the name of Christianity, and second, by substituting a form of Christianity for real service to God.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.2*

It is not simply desired to force unbelievers to keep the day so as not to disturb those who wish to keep it, but it is desired to prevent church-members from breaking the day, for the indictment charged against the Sunday newspaper is that it is a continual temptation thrown in the way of church-members, and leads them to neglect church duties. Again and again we have seen it stated in religious journals that the Sunday newspapers could not exist if it were not for the patronage of church-members. Therefore the desire about suppression of Sunday newspapers is that these weak-kneed professed Christians may not be tempted to belie their profession. In other words they ask the State to discipline their church-members. So that the protection they want is not to the Sunday, nor to the right of the people to observe the Sunday, but to the churches.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.3*

Notice that Mr. Crafts says that while they want this Sunday law, they don't desire to hinder those who observe another day from working on the first day of the week, unless the work be of such a nature, shop-keeping for instance, as will interfere with the general rest. But how will shop-keeping interfere with the general rest? A man may have a store and keep it open and not interfere with

anyone, if he does not go out on the street and drag people into it. If he remains in his store, as reputable dealers usually do, and waits upon people who voluntarily come in to do business, he certainly does not interfere with anybody's rest. The whole scheme of this Sunday legislation seems to be based on the idea that the people, church-members as well as others, are bent on doing as they please on Sunday, and that if any possible chance is given them to do business or seek pleasure they will run after it, and that to keep them to anything like an observance of Sunday, every possibility to break it must be taken out of the way, so that it will be impossible for them to do work or find amusements. What business has the State to say what kind of work a man may do upon a certain day? The statement that they do not intend to stop any work except that which will interfere with the general rest, is a mere blind to cover up their design to stop everything. For it is certain that if so quiet an occupation as shop-keeping will interfere with the general rest, there is nothing that will not be considered as interfering with it.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.4*

Mr. Crafts further states that the wording of the Blair Sunday bill, as originally presented, showed that it was designed to promote the religious observance of the day, "but only by giving opportunity for the culture of conscience on the part of those who desired it through the general suspension of public business." As much as to say that a man could not cultivate his conscience if somebody else were working. Mr. Crafts must be one of those unfortunate individuals who think that religion is a matter for Sunday only, for he doesn't propose to hinder people from laboring six days in the week, yet he implies that a man can't develop his conscience unless everybody stops working. The thing is absurd on the face of it. It simply shows an effort to try to find an excuse for an unjust, oppressive law; but the excuse is so thin that it only makes more apparent the weakness and injustice of the case.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.5*

Again Mr. Crafts says:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.6*

"It was stated in the hearing of the chief promoter of the counter-petition four months and a half ago, at the time of the Washington Convention and hearing, that the word 'promote' in this connection would be changed to 'protect,' so that public worship so far as this

bill is concerned, would simply have that protection which any legitimate institution of the American people is entitled to on that day.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.7*

We have no patience with any such quibbling as this. Mr. Crafts knows as well as anybody that public worship is already granted more protection than any other institution on any day of the week. There are the most severe laws against the disturbance of public religious assemblies. The bill had no reference to protection of public worship, and was not designed for any such purpose. We say this without any reservation, because if all the burden these men had were simply the protection of public worship, they would be content with the laws already existing. No one would ever think of petitioning Congress to pass a law making it a crime to commit murder, because there are abundant laws in every State concerning that. And so the fact that religious worship is already protected, abundantly shows that when Congress votes this law, they have something else in view entirely, that is not the protection of worship, but the enforcement of the religious observance of the day, just as the bill itself says.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.8*

But Mr. Crafts continues:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.9*

“Those who are urging this counter-petition by voice and pen attempt to enlist yet others in their motley army, by declaring what is as ridiculous as it is false, that the Sabbath-rest movement is only a preparatory step to a further measure compelling everybody to attend church on the first day of the week.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.10*

It is true that the charge has been repeatedly made in the AMERICAN SENTINEL and elsewhere that the whole tendency of this movement is toward compulsory church attendance. These arguments have never been made and no attempt has been made to meet them. And now when Mr. Crafts notices the charge he simply says that it is ridiculous and false. But a simple statement like that does not meet the case at all. The AMERICAN SENTINEL has not made any statements concerning the motive of those who desire Sunday legislation, but has simply declared what this thing would inevitably lead to. If it had said that they deliberately intend to



enforce church attendance, of could they say that they do not, and that would be sufficient; but when we charge upon their sentiment, that it will necessarily result in compulsory church attendance, they cannot turn aside the force of this charge by simply asserting that it is absurd. The duty devolves upon them to show wherein it is absurd.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.11*

Now we will just make a very brief argument that has before been made in support of this charge, and then will ask Mr. Crafts to show its absurdity. We take first the statement made by Mr. Crafts himself at the first hearing before the Senate Committee. He said:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.12*

“The postmaster-general agrees with me, and stated this morning, that it should not be possible for any post-master in this country to run the United States post-office as a rival and competitor and antagonist of the churches. The law allows the post-office to be kept open during the church hours unless the first mail of the day comes during those hours. If it comes five minutes or before the church service begins, the post-office can be run and is run in many cases all through church hours, as the rival and competitor and antagonist of the churches.” “A law forbidding the opening of the United States post-office during the usual hours of public worship would remedy this difficulty, and would be better than nothing; but we desire more than this. The law should also take from the local post-master the power to keep his employes at work at such hours as would prevent them from going to church.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.13*

The idea of this is that the keeping open of the post-offices on Sunday prevents employes from going to church. Now suppose that the law is secured, and the post-offices are closed, and the clerks do not *then* attend church. It will be seen then that the reason why people work on Sunday instead of going to church is because they would rather do so. The Sunday-law people understand this just as well as we do, but that does not satisfy them. The churches must be attended. Now we submit as a reasonable proposition that if the post-offices are closed for the sole purpose of getting the employes to church, and that move does not succeed in getting them to church, then the next step will be to try some other method, and if that fails to try still another, until they have a simple, direct law

requiring everyone unconditionally to attend church on Sunday. Then they will have just what Mr. Crafts at the Washington Convention said they desired to have,—“the ideal Sabbath of the Puritans.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.14*

Again, the Rev. Henry Wilson, at the Elgin Convention, said plainly, while arguing for the Sunday law, “The industries of the world should be silent one day in seven that the toiler may hear the invitation of the Master, Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden and I will give you rest, and that the temple of God may be built without the sound of the hammer.” It is a simple statement that all they want the Sunday law for is that people may go to church. They want the people to hear their version of the invitation of the Master invitation of the Master; but suppose the toiler does not care to hear that invitation, even when he is forcibly compelled to desist from labor. Why, then, they will necessarily take steps to compel him to listen.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 194.15*

In the same line was the complaint made by Dr. M. C. Briggs, in a Sunday-law meeting held in Oakland a few years ago. He said in substance, “You relegate the teaching of morals to the churches, and then make it impossible for us to teach the people, by allowing them to go where they please.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.1*

Now, if Mr. Crafts thinks that the charge that the Sunday-law movement will result in compelling people to attend church is absurd and false, we will give him space in the AMERICAN SENTINEL to show it.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.2*

One more point we will notice, and then we will leave Mr. Crafts for the present. He says:—*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.3*

“The laws of our statute books that re-enact the seventh commandment are as distinctly Biblical in their origin as the laws that re-enact a part of the fourth commandment.”*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.4*

We would ask what the necessity is for the reenactment of either the seventh or the fourth commandment. Nay, what possibility is there for the re-enacting of either of these commandments, or for any other commandment of the Decalogue? Those commandments

never have been abrogated. They stand as firm as when first given by the Almighty. Therefore there is no necessity for their re-enactment, and certainly it would be the height of presumption for any body of men to presume to re-enact laws given by the Creator. To assume that the State can do such work is to place it not only equal with God, but above God; and this assumption on the part of Mr. Crafts shows the work in which he is engaged to be papal in its character. Not only so, but it shows that Mr. Crafts and those who are laboring with him to the same end have no understanding of the commandments, or they would not make so ridiculous an assumption as that the State can either enact or re-enact them.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.5*

Still further, such a statement shows that those who make it are preparing to sink not only themselves but the whole people into the grossest immorality under the garb of Christianity. And here is the proof. The State can enforce only outward obedience to the commandments; but simply outward obedience to the commandments is no obedience at all. A man may be the grossest libertine, and still not commit any violation of the seventh commandment of which the State could take any notice. Yet, Mr. Crafts says that the laws of the State do re-enact the seventh and fourth commandments. This shows then, so great a misunderstanding of the commandments as to suppose that they require only such service as the State can enforce. Therefore, since the law of God is the standard of morality, those who hold with Mr. Crafts that the State can “re-enact” and enforce that law, will consider themselves moral if they comply with as much of that law as the State can enforce, that is, if they simply observe it outwardly. In other words, they will be in the very same condition as were the scribes and Pharisees, of whom Christ says, “Ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men’s bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also appear outwardly righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” If this charge is a severe one, the responsibility of it rests with Mr. Crafts and his fellows, and not with us.*AMS July 17, 1889, page 195.6*

E. J. W.

## July 31, 1889

**“To Crush The Liquor Traffic?” American Sentinel 4, 27.**

E. J. Waggoner

On Sunday evening, June 30, the Pennsylvania Sabbath Association held a meeting in the Salem M. E. Church; Philadelphia, at which several active workers for a Sunday law were present. One of the principal speakers was Lewis D. Vail, the attorney for the Law and Order Society. After speaking of the continental Sunday, and arguing that the working men would be great sufferers by its introduction into this country, Mr. Vail spent the greater portion of his time talking about saloons and licenses. Speaking of a recent Supreme Court decision, he said:—*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.1*

“The Supreme Court says that their location is not a matter of public convenience, and they can all be located in a solid block, if they so elect. These so-called wholesalers can sell at any time on a week day, and eventually they will sell on Sunday. They will send their own men to the Legislature, and will work to control every branch of the Government. What you and I have to do is to fight for this control of the Government, and vote only for men who are pledged to work for good laws and for a better observance of the Sabbath. You may rest assured that God will look out for his Sunday, but we must do our work. God will grind this glorious country into powder if we disobey his laws. If a so-called Christian man votes for a man opposed to God’s law, even if he belongs to a dozen churches, the devil will get him at last.”*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.2*

One need not take long to determine from the above what the Law and Order Society regards as the greater evil, the liquor traffic or Sunday work. Mr. Vail seems to feel very bad to think that the liquor-sellers are in danger of controlling every branch of the Government, and that they will locate their saloons anywhere they please. But the only remedy he and his Law and Order Society have in mind is, to fight for the control of the Government, and when they get this control to-do what? To crush out the liquor traffic? Oh no; to stop the sale of liquor on Sunday. The Law and Order Society

has not yet got educated to the idea that selling liquor on any other day of the week than Sunday is disorderly.*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.3*

If Mr. Vail really thinks that Sunday belongs to the Lord, he would do well to leave it with him and trust him to take care of it; but we cannot avoid the suspicion that the reason why he and the other leaders in the Sunday-law move are working so zealously for Sunday laws is, that they do not believe that God has any regard for Sunday any more than for any other day; and they are afraid that if they leave it with him the law will not be enforced, and they are determined to make people keep Sunday whether or no.*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.4*

Rev. Mr. Redner, speaking of the prevailing disregard for Sunday, said the trouble was not so much with the chief justice and the other justices as with Christians, and professed Christians. That is exactly the point. Sunday is a church day; it is one of the days which "the church," according to the catechism, commands to be kept holy along with Christmas, New Years, Easter, St. Patrick's day, etc. But a large majority of professed Christians do not carry out the commands of the church. They disregard the obligations which they took upon themselves when they joined the church; and because of this disregard of church law, by those who belong to the church, the Sunday is not kept as a holy day. And now certain leaders in the church are knocking at the door of Congress with all their might to induce that body to pass a law to enforce the observance of Sunday.*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.5*

In other words, they are asking Congress to come to the help of the churches, and compel church members to obey its laws. This is the sole object of Sunday legislation, and stamps the movement for Sunday laws to be purely a step toward the securing of Church and State.*AMS July 31, 1889, page 209.6*

E. J. W.

**August 7, 1889**

**“Relation of Civil Governments to the Moral Law” American Sentinel 4, 28.**

E. J. Waggoner

Among right-minded persons there can be no question as to the right of earthly governments to exist. There is a class of persons known as “Anarchists,” who deny that there is any necessity for government or law, or that one person has a right for exercise authority over another; but these persons, true to their name, believe in nothing; had they the power, they would cast God down from the throne of the universe as readily as they would the earth monarch from his limited dominion. With such persons we have nothing to do. It is useless to argue with those who will not admit self-evident propositions. The only argument that that can effectually reach them is the strong arm of the law, which they hate. Our argument shall be addressed to those who acknowledge God as the Creator and the supreme Ruler of the universe, and the Bible as the complete and perfect revelation of his will concerning his creatures on this earth. With such, the declaration of the prophet, that “the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will” (*Daniel 4:25*), and the statement of the apostle, that “the powers that be are ordained of God” (*Romans 13:1*), together with many other Scripture references to earthly governments, are sufficient evidence that nations have a right to exist. *AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.1*

Admitting that earthly governments are in the divine order of things, the next question is, For what purpose? The word itself indicates the answer: Governments exist for the purpose of governing, or, in other words, for the purpose of enforcing laws by which justice and harmony may be maintained. The apostle Peter says that governments are sent by the Lord “for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well.” *1 Peter 2:13, 14*. Paul says also that the ruler is God’s minister to execute wrath upon them that do evil. *Romans 13:4. AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.2*

The next step in the investigation would naturally be to find out what laws earthly rulers are to execute. This is plainly indicated in the

text first referred to. If the ruler is a minister of God, then the laws against which he is to execute *wrath*, need be such laws as God can approve—they must be in perfect harmony with the laws of God. Indeed, it could not be otherwise; for since God's law is *perfect* (*Psalms* 19:7), covering in its range every act and thought (see *Ecclesiastes* 12:13, 14; *Hebrews* 4:12; *Matthew* 5:20-22, 27, 28), even, human law must be embraced with its limits. No one can dissent from this proposition. It is one of the fundamental principles of human law, as will be seen by the following extract from Blackstone's commentaries:—*AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.3*

“Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, that no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And beside it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy, for with regard for such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to the former. To instance in the case of murder: This is expressly forbidden by the divine, and demonstrably by the natural law; and from these prohibitions arises the true unlawfulness of this crime. These human laws that assess a punishment to it, do not at all increase its guilt, or superadd any fresh obligation, *in fora conscientia* [in the court of conscience], to abstain from its perpetration. Nay, if any human law should allow or enjoin as to commit it, we are bound to transgress that human law, or else we must offend both the natural and the divine.”—*Blackstone, vol. 1, p. 36. AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.4*

The State, then, according to both sacred and secular testimony, has no power to contravene the law of God, it cannot declare an act to be right or wrong unless God's law so declares it, and in that case the innocence or guilt arising from the performance of the act is due solely to the enactments of God's moral law, and not to the human enactment, the latter being subordinate to the former. The indifferent points, in which, as Blackstone says, human laws have their only inherent force, are such as regulate commerce, the tariff upon imported goods, etc. These are simply matters of convenience

or expediency.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.5*

These questions being settled, the last and most important one is this: How far in morals have human laws jurisdiction? or, For how much of the violation of the moral law has God ordained that earthly rulers shall be his ministers to execute wrath? The Bible, which settles every important question concerning man's duty, must also divide this. We shall find the answer in the thirteenth chapter of Romans, a portion of which must be briefly examined:—*AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.6*

“Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good.” *Romans 13:1-4.AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.7*

The “high powers” do not include the *highest* power. While every soul is to be subject to earthly powers, some are absolved from allegiance to God. The service of the two will not be incompatible, so long as the earthly powers fulfill the object for which they are ordained, viz., to act as ministers for *good*. When they forget this, their subjects are bound to follow the example of the apostles under similar circumstances, and say, “We ought to obey God rather than men.” *Acts 2:28.AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.8*

The verses above quoted from the thirteenth of Romans show plainly that earthly governments alone are the subject of consideration in that chapter. The following verses show, with equal clearness, the extent of their jurisdiction:—*AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.9*

“Owe no man any thing, but to love one another: for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet; and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his



neighbour; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” *Romans 13:8-10.AMS August 7, 1889, page 218.10*

“He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law,” and “love is the fulfilling of the law.” What law?—Why, the law concerning which earthly rulers are the ministers. The law of God is summed up in the two great commandments: “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,” and, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” See *Matthew 22:36-40*. The second great commandment, defining our duty to our fellow-men, is expanded into the last six precepts of the decalogue, showing to what law he refers when he says, “He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law.” To make this still *more* emphatic, he closes his enumeration of the commandments composing the last table of the decalogue, with the statement that “love worketh no ill to his neighbor, therefore love is *the fulfilling* of the law.” Now since the apostle is speaking only of earthly governments, and the duty of their subjects, we know that he who does no ill to his neighbor—loves his neighbor as himself—has fulfilled all the law of which these earthly governments are empowered to take notice.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 219.1*

Thus it is seen that Paul’s argument concerning the office of civil government is confined to the last six commandments of the decalogue. But let it not be supposed that human governments can recognize all violations of even these last six commandments. Earthly governments are solely for the purpose of securing to their subjects mutual rights. So long as a man does no ill to his neighbor, the law cannot molest him. But any violation of the law of God affects the individual himself first of all. For example: Christ said that the seventh commandment may be violated by a single lustful look and evil desire; but such look and desire do not injure anyone except the individual indulging in them; it is only when they result in the commission of the open act of adultery, thus injuring others besides the adulterer himself, that human governments can interfere. To God alone belongs the power to punish sins of the mind.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 219.2*

Of the sixth commandment we are told that whosoever hates another has violated it; but the State cannot prevent a man from

hating another, nor take any notice of hatred until it culminates in open crime.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 219.3*

There are innumerable ways in which the fifth commandment may be violated, for which the civil government has neither the right nor the power to punish. Only in extreme cases can the State interfere. A man may be covetous, and yet he is not liable to punishment until his covetousness results in open theft or swindling. Yet before the *act* is accomplished, of which the State can take notice, a man's covetousness or lying or hatred may work great annoyance to his neighbors.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 219.4*

We see, then, how imperfect are human governments even within the sphere allotted to them. God alone has the power to read the heart, and he alone has the right to "bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or whether it be evil." With matters of purely a religious nature-those which rest solely upon our relation to God, and not to our neighbor-human governments have no right to interfere. Concerning them, each individual is answerable to God alone.*AMS August 7, 1889, page 219.5*

## August 14, 1889

**“An Unchristian Union” American Sentinel 4, 29.**

E. J. Waggoner

At the State Convention of the Vermont Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, something over a year ago, the 170 delegates adopted by unanimous vote,*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.1*

“Resolved, That we believe Christ, as the author and head of government, should be recognized in all political platforms, and by all societies, and we will rejoice to see the day when a political party distinctly gives such recognition.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.2*

Miss Willard is reported as having said concerning this resolution, “There is not a W. C. T. U. in the land that will not echo this.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.3*

This is sufficient of itself to settle the question as to whether or not the W. C. T. U. is an ally to the National Reform Association. But it was not especially for the purpose of commenting on this resolution that we quoted it, but to place before our readers some correspondence which took place in regard to it, and which, though old, will doubtless be new to a great majority of the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, and will be of interest, as the principles are ever the same.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.4*

Shortly after the passage of this resolution, Mrs. Lucinda B. Chandler addressed an open letter to Miss Willard, which was deemed of sufficient value by the latter to merit what she termed “a reply.” After a brief introduction Mrs. Chandler proceeds as follows: —*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.5*

“It is impossible for me to understand the record of the teaching of Jesus so as to claim him as ‘the author and head of government.’ He emphatically declared that his kingdom was not of this world. Jesus of Nazareth neither established ecclesiastical nor civil government. He founded neither church nor State. The great burden of his teaching was to pronounce the relation of humanity to

the Father as one of spirit, and the only worship he enjoined was to worship in spirit and in truth.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.6*

“How much would this true worship and love of the Spirit be promoted by grafting upon political platforms the name of Christ as ‘the author and head of government.’*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.7*

“With your fertile imagination I beg you to forecast the effect upon the native honesty and integrity of office-seekers and political partisans, of making the condition of a place in office and political power a religious test, and the subscribing to a claim that Jesus Christ is ‘the author and head’ of our national affairs. Have we not already enough of lying and hypocrisy in our land? Have we not enough of centralizing power already oppressing the people in mammoth-bred monopoly? Shall we have added a religious test to the sycophancy, and hypocritical pretense?”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.8*

It would seem as though this should commend itself to everybody as just criticism. It is incomprehensible how any one with any knowledge of American politics, or with any knowledge of human nature, should think that politics will be purified and human nature elevated by a political party having as the chief plank in its platform the recognition of Christ as “author and head of government.” When we see how ready men are to profess anything, in order that they may advance their own interests; when the history of the world contains scarcely anything else than the record of the time-serving policy of men, of how men have sold their influence and their honor and everything, to gain popularity and power; how men have professed one religion to-day and another to-morrow, according as one or the other had the greatest hold upon the masses of the people—it is as clear as noon-day that if a political party should base its platform chiefly on the recognition of Christ as “author and head of government” it would only make hypocritical followers of Christ. Just as soon as it should by any means,—and it could not do it by Christian methods,—begin to gain control of affairs, all the baser element, all those who intend to feed at the public crib at any cost, would turn and support it; and men who are gross and profane and licentious in private, if not in public, would shout themselves

hoarse for Christ and his kingdom.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.9*

Again we quote:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.10*

“Religious tests as qualification for civic service would not develop a spirit of truth. Religious tests and a formal recognition of the name of God or Christ would inevitably become the fettering gyves of an assumptive hierarchy. The Protestant idea and principle having abnegated itself by adopting the method of hierarchial authority, would be swept into the abyss where liberty had already been cast, wounded unto death.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.11*

“No, no, my much-respected sister, I must hope that your more matured consideration will lead you to a different conclusion and determination. I cannot believe you wish religious liberty overthrown. I cannot think you would welcome the reign of hypocrisy and cant as an agency of political power. To enforce outward conduct by offering political preference would not advance either the spirit of truth or of love.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.12*

We quote again:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.13*

“Righteousness, justice, truth, and above all ‘love which vaunteth not itself and is not puffed up,’ cannot be actualized in peoples or nations through legislative enactment.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.14*

With this last paragraph everybody ought to agree. It is self-evident. Love is not a thing that can be forced. Who is there so foolish as to think that one person can be compelled to love another? Who is there that would think of using physical force to get a child to love its teacher? and yet the W. C. T. U. and other National Reform bodies think to promote love for Christ and his truth by legal enactments! The statement of their desire should be sufficient to show the folly of it.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.15*

The letter proceeds as follows:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.16*

“It is earnestly to be hoped that the W. C. T. U. will not lend its influence to any proposed political measures to destroy our constitutional liberties, religious or civil, but that they will continue to work diligently on the lines of education, toward a higher physiological, social, and moral standard of life on the comprehensive principle of temperance.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.17*

We heartily second this wish. With the legitimate work of this W. C. T. U. as we have always been in sympathy. If they would ... they begun, to labor for the advancement of temperance by moral and intellectual *thought* they would never have a word of criticism from us. We heartily support them in their work to educate the children and all others in the principles of health and temperance and morality; but we cannot go with them when they depart from this reasonable and just method of work,—the only method which can accomplish any real results,—and adopt the unreasonable and unjust and wicked method of attempting to compel men to be Christlike.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.18*

We do not see how anyone can answer the following paragraph of the open letter to Miss Willard, except by endorsing it:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.19*

“Jesus said to Zebedee’s sons: ‘Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you. Whosoever would be chief among you, let him be your servant.’ The real followers of Christ will serve and minister unto humanity, and not seek to establish political power by means of religious test, even of the name of Christ.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.20*

The following also is worthy of careful consideration:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.21*

“If the church under the constitutional freedom secured to it cannot leaven the people with a love of justice, and make itself a power against political corruption by its higher life, and the spirit of truth in its membership, it would surely fail of accomplishing it by platform dogmas or constitutional amendments.”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.22*

This last paragraph strikes at the very root of the matter, and shows that such a course as is marked out by the National Reformers is derogatory to the Christian religion. It virtually says there is no power in the Spirit of Christ, and that God, working through his own divinely appointed ways, cannot accomplish the result that he designed; that if men work according to the rules he has laid down they will fail, and that therefore they must inaugurate a system of their own.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.23*

Further than this, it can be shown that a political party with such a platform as is desired by the W. C. T. U. can succeed only by stultifying itself. It can come to power only by going directly contrary to all the principles of Christ and his kingdom, which they profess to wish to establish. Thus, political parties have influence according to the number of votes that they can control. These alone count. Now why is there call for such a party as the W. C. T. U. desire to see? Why do they wish it? Simply because existing parties are corrupt. And why are existing parties corrupt? Because the men who control them are corrupt; and not only are those who control them corrupt, but the pen they control are corrupt. In other words, politics is corrupt because the good men, the Christian men, and the men of high moral principle in the government are in the minority. They are outvoted by those who have no principle but selfish policy. Now how is this reform party to secure the controlling influence? Only by meeting these corrupt elements on their own ground, by opposing policy to policy, and by wire-pulling and underhanded means, such as are now employed; and then if they ever get into power, what will constitute their strength? Simply the number of votes they can secure to back their principles? And from what ranks will these voters have been secured?—from the ranks of the existing corrupt parties, from professional politicians who will have taken their stand because they have been led to think that there is profit in it; and as they will have a party professing allegiance to Christ, but made up of the very same men who composed and controlled the old parties, and holding the very same principles; and, worse than all, these men will think themselves good Christians because they belong to the “Christian party.” We say that all good Christians ought to pray to be delivered from complicity with any such party as this.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 226.24*

We say nothing concerning anyone's personal Christianity, but we are sure that no one who is really and intelligently Christian can ever favor any such scheme.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.1*

But how did Miss Willard reply to the letter from which we have quoted these strong, sensible paragraphs? She acknowledged the whole point in the questions so pertinently addressed to her, and simply reiterated her declaration in favor of a national Christianity. Here is a specimen:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.2*

“Can the heart of God beat anywhere more potently than in a party and a platform that allies itself to God as revealed in that Christ spirit which knows neither foreign nor native, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, but lifts humanity to one equal level of opportunity and hope?”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.3*

It is indeed true that in Christ there is neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, and all are one; but does Miss Willard expect this state of things to be brought about by political action? Every Christian knows, both from observation and experience, that there is nothing but the personal work of the Spirit of Christ in the heart that can break down distinctions of race and personal peculiarities and preferences, so that different peoples may unite as one. But can party platforms control the Spirit of Christ and bring it into the hearts of men. The fact that written creeds do not make Christians is almost universally recognized; and what would a political party with a platform recognizing Christ be but a creed; and how can such a creed have any more effect in transforming the life and character than a creed which men may receive or reject voluntarily?*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.4*

There is indeed a party whose platform and all who compose it should be allied together by a tie that would break down distinctions of nationality and personal peculiarity, and that party is the church. Those only who are Christians can unite in the most perfect fellowship, but those who are Christians are members of this church, which is His body. It follows therefore that when Miss Willard desires a party that shall have this for its object she simply desires a political church, in other words, a union of Church and State. Of course, the object will fail of being achieved, and she will



have simply a form, and such a church will not be the church of Christ.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.5*

Here is Miss Willard's idea of recognizing Christ. She says:—*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.6*

“Christ is to-day the great world force for righteousness, for gentleness, for purity; and I believe with all my heart the world can in no other way do itself so great a favor as by making much of his mission. He is so high as to be seen from everywhere; to whom else can the nations rally with such unanimity. He is so vast as to encompass us all in his plan and his record; shall we not let him gather us as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings? He is so universal as to be claimed by all, from Catholics to Spiritualists, and even agnostics and atheists say with Pilate, ‘I find no fault in the man.’ Can we not all then consent to be claimed by him as loyal, loving followers?”*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.7*

We are amazed that a woman of so much culture and presumably Christian experience as Miss Willard, can be so blinded as to think that a union of Catholics, Spiritualists, agnostics, and atheists, together with evangelical churches, upon a platform recognizing Christ, can be anything more than the most hollow and wicked sham.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.8*

Here the reader may see that all we have charged upon the movement is just. There will be no Christianity in it whatever. He who says that there will be real Christianity in the union, must say that infidels, agnostics, and atheists are real Christians. We believe that these men can be good citizens, but we are certain that they are not Christians. It needs no argument to show that a man who denies Christ is not a Christian. If it is true, as Miss Willard says, that all the Christian Unions in the United States are in favor of this thing, and are working for it, it is true the National W. C. T. U. is working itself into a position where it will be not a Christian Union, but an un-Christian union.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.9*

We do not know that we need to quote any more from this letter. It shows that the National Reform party, of which Miss Willard stands as the best representative, is visionary in the extreme. We are willing to grant that they desire a better state of things than now

exists. They see that there is wickedness and corruption, and they desire to see a reversed state; but, they have dreamed an impossible thing. Their desires may be laudable, but their methods of work do not indicate a knowledge either of human nature or of the gospel of Christ.*AMS August 14, 1889, page 227.10*

E. J. W.

## September 11, 1889

**“Sunday Prohibition” American Sentinel 4, 31.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the SENTINEL of May 1, 1889, we referred to a bill passed by the Tennessee Legislature, making it a misdemeanor to sell wine, ale, or beer on Sunday. In commenting upon this we stated that the bill makes it a righteous act to sell those articles on the other six days of the week. To this statement exception has been taken. A gentleman who writes that he is friendly to the work of the SENTINEL, says that he thinks it is wrong to sell intoxicating drinks at any time; but believes that if the traffic cannot be wholly suppressed, it is right to suppress it partially. We will state in brief our position, and explain the statement that we made.*AMS September 11, 1889, page 261.1*

We believe that the liquor traffic is entirely wrong. We are also in favor of suppressing it to any extent that can be done, and we do not decry a measure that will actually diminish the sale of liquor, for the simple reason that it is not total suppression. We believe that even less than half a loaf is better than no bread, but we have yet to see any evidence that the closing of Sunday saloons diminishes the amount of liquor drank. But even if this could be shown, it would not at all militate against our comment on the bill passed by the Tennessee Legislature. Our comment had reference not so much to the closing of saloons on Sunday, as to the way in which the matter was put. It was stated that selling not mean that it is not a misdemeanor to sell it on other days, it does not mean anything. That it does mean to convey the idea that it is net a misdemeanor to sell it on other days, is shown by the fact that there is no penalty attached to the selling of it on other days of the week, whereas there would be a penalty if it were considered a misdemeanor. But a misdemeanor is misbehavior, wrong-doing; therefore to specify Sunday as the day on which it shall be considered a misdemeanor to sell liquor is virtually the same as saying that there is nothing wrong in it on other days of the week.*AMS September 11, 1889, page 261.2*

We do not see how anyone can controvert this view, and so we repeat, as we have often said, that the great objection we have to so-called Sunday legislation is that it tends to lower the standard of what temperance really is, and tends to make the liquor traffic respectable, thus making it impossible to gain the end that is desired by many who are earnest temperance people, and conscientious in their efforts to stop the sale of liquor on Sunday.*AMS September 11, 1889, page 262.1*

E. J. W.

## September 18, 1889

“Our Position” *American Sentinel* 4, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

It has been our duty in our work to criticise very severely at times the actions and sayings of certain men,—churchmen, ministers of the gospel and lay workers,—and also the action of certain religious organs, in connection with the movement to secure national enforcement of Sunday observance. It has not been a pleasant task to do this, and we have not done so because of any feeling of antagonism to the individuals so criticised; much less have we done so because of any antagonism whatever to religion; but there are some who do not distinguish carefully, and there are others, we are sorry to say, who willfully misrepresent our motives. Therefore we will make a few statements.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.1*

We do not oppose this Sunday movement because we have no respect for the convictions of those who observe Sunday. Not only do we reverence the Bible, but we have respect for every man's belief concerning the Bible. We are perfectly willing to afford to every person the free privilege of believing as he chooses. Not only are we willing but we insist upon it for every person. We believe that the government must protect all. We believe that the government should protect the Sunday observer in his observance of Sunday, just the same as it protects one who observes another day of the week in his observance of that day.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.2*

It is only the unchristian methods of doing what professes to be Christian work, but which is in reality unchristian, that we oppose.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.3*

We oppose Sunday legislation not because we are not willing that people should observe Sunday if they wish to, and not because we are unwilling that the government should see that they are not interfered with in their observance of Sun day, but we oppose the Sunday movement because it is unchristian, and it is shown to be unchristian by the unchristian methods employed in its

maintenance.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.4*

We have the kindest feelings for all religious people. We would grant them the same consideration in their belief and practice that we would ask them to show us. It is only when they claim as their right that which they are not willing to grant to those who differ with them that we oppose them. When they do that, they are doing just that which they would not have others do to them, and that very thing shows their movement to be unchristian, because it is contrary to the rule laid down by Christ.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.5*

Let this distinction be kept constantly in view. Anything that can be shown by argument to be right, the SENTINEL will not oppose. Nay; more; although we do not believe that Sunday has the slightest sacredness, or has any claim to respect, more than Monday or Tuesday, yet if they will confine their advocacy of it to legitimate lines,—namely, the pulpit, the press, the Sunday-school, the family,—the SENTINEL would never say a word against them. In fact if this were so, there would be no SENTINEL.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.6*

The advocates of Sunday have the most perfect right to go anywhere or everywhere that they can secure a hearing, and speak night and day, teaching people to observe Sunday as a day of rest, appealing to their conscience and bringing arguments to bear upon them. They have a right to publish papers and circulate them everywhere, wherever they can induce people to read them. Against such work the SENTINEL would never lift its voice. But when they advocate the use of force, when they advocate measures which they would by no means consent to have carried out toward themselves were the conditions reversed, then the SENTINEL will oppose them, and it will call upon every consistent Christian to unite with it in its opposition.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.7*

We want it distinctly understood that the SENTINEL is opposed to nothing that is Christian-like. It was not started with the idea of antagonizing Christianity or any Christian movement. With doctrinal matters it has nothing to do. Its sole work is the maintenance of

religious liberty of thought and action, because under such circumstances alone can true Christianity flourish. It does not claim to be the arbiter of what Christianity is, it does not presume to say what men ought to believe, or what they are to teach, or what religious customs they are to practice; it has only to do with efforts to propagate views by methods that tend only to oppression. Who is there that cannot stand upon the same platform?*AMS September 18, 1889, page 264.8*

E. J. W.

**“The State to Let Religion Alone” American Sentinel 4, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner

We recently had the pleasure of listening to one of a series of talks by Bishop Vincent, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, on the epistles of Paul to Timothy, and were much edified by some remarks that he made upon the first two verses of the second chapter of the first epistle, which read as follows:—*AMS September 18, 1889, page 265.1*

“I exhort therefore; that first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty.”*AMS September 18, 1889, page 265.2*

Said he, “We should pray for kings and those in authority—for what purpose? That the church may have power in the government? No. That our ministers may have good appointments under the government? No. That the church may have the authority of the government to carry forward its work? No. But that they may so mind their business that we may have a quiet and tranquil life. The church makes a gross mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position, and to influence temporal power.”*AMS September 18, 1889, page 265.3*

He said that he always admired the answer that Diogenes made to Alexander, when the king visited the philosopher and asked him

what he could do for him. The philosopher answered, "Stand out of the light." "Such," said he, "should be the position of the church. All that Christians should ask of the government is to let us alone, and to stand out of the way so that we may live quietly and peaceably, and carry on the work of the gospel by the power of the Spirit." *AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.1*

The bishop said further, "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration on the part of the church for temporal power. What the church wants is spiritual power." He then stated that the spiritual power of a church always declines in proportion as the church gains temporal power. *AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.2*

These are truths that have been time and again set forth in the AMERICAN SENTINEL, but we are glad to be able to present them anew from the mouth of so prominent and eminent a man as Bishop J. H. Vincent. It shows that the work of the AMERICAN SENTINEL in opposing the so-called National Reform movement, instead of being infidel or atheistic, is most truly Christian, and that the most active Christian workers,—those who have a right to that title,—promulgate the very same principles that the SENTINEL does *AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.3*

While we in our work often have to make severe strictures on certain churchmen, we would not have anyone get the idea that it is because we are opposed to churches or Christianity. Our strictures upon those persons are not because we oppose whatever of true Christianity they may possess, but it is because they are doing not only unchristian but antichristian work. They are attempting to secure the very thing which Bishop Vincent says is the abomination of abominations in the church, and tends to dearth of spirituality. Therefore we may say without fear of successful contradiction that the AMERICAN SENTINEL is working for the conservation of true Christianity in this country. *AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.4*

E. J. W.

**“Does it Pay” American Sentinel 4, 34.**

E. J. Waggoner



Not long since, we listened to a lecture by Col. Elliott F. Shepard, president of the American Sabbath Union, on the question, "*Does the Sabbath pay?*" The lecture was notable chiefly for what the lecturer did not say, but there were one or two points which are worthy of careful attention, inasmuch as they show the principle, or rather the *lack of Christian* principle in this movement for the legal observance of Sunday. The whole thing is contained in the subject of the lecture, viz., "Does it pay?" We will note a few statements. Said Mr. Shepard:—*AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.5*

"Divine finance; what is it? The Old and the New Testament agree in contradicting Wall Street, and show that prosperity is to be found in obedience to God's commandments?"*AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.6*

This was the main feature of the lecture, namely the proof that more money could be made by resting on Sunday than by working upon it; and nothing but a mercenary motive was placed before the people. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Shepard said to the chairman of the meeting, "I would make some converts here to-night;" and then he proceeded to state that the railroads of the United States have suffered pecuniary loss because of their Sunday work. To emphasize this he made a little mathematical calculation to demonstrate, which we shall not try to follow; but the conclusion of which was that a manufacturer would make thirty-six per cent. more on Sunday might make fourteen per cent. on his investment, by a strict observance of the day he would make fifty per cent. on his investment. This shows a gain of thirty-six per cent. for Sunday observance. And then the question was asked, Which is better, for a man to work on Sunday and make fourteen per cent. or to rest on Sunday and make fifty per cent. Anyone will say the latter is better."*AMS September 18, 1889, page 266.7*

We are not at all convinced that Mr. Shepard's mathematical calculations are correct, but let that pass. The question that at once arose in our mind was this: If Sunday-keeping pays pecuniarily, and if it can be demonstrated that a merchant or a manufacturer can make thirty-six per cent. more by resting on Sunday than by working, what need is there to ask the government to pass laws making it a crime for working on Sunday? Are the merchants and

manufacturers in the United States so blind to their own business interests, so obtuse, so dull where dollars and cents are concerned, that they cannot be made to see the gain there is in Sunday observance? and, seeing it, would they deliberately choose a small per cent. in preference to a very large per cent? We are forced to conclude that there is either something wrong with Mr. Shepard's mathematics or with his position as president of the American Sabbath Union. But this is not the worst feature of the case.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 267.1*

The pernicious effect of such teaching as that of Mr. Shepard cannot be seen now, but it will be demonstrated in time. The only argument he presented in the course of the whole evening (and his discourse was on Sunday evening too) was that there would be pecuniary profit in resting on Sunday,—that Sunday-keeping would invariably bring prosperity, and that Sunday-breaking would as invariably result in financial ruin. Now any person of common sense knows that this is not so; but that is not the point. People do not always use their common sense, and that idea of Mr. Shepard's is getting to be quite common. Now couple this with another statement that he made in the same discourse. Said he, "It is useless for any one to claim that the Sabbath [by which he meant Sunday, of course] has any rights, except as they plant themselves on the divine commandment" He had already stated that the fourth commandment was the first commandment with blessing, and the only blessing that he made reference to was financial prosperity. Therefore the natural conclusion from his talk would be that the only blessing that is connected with the fourth commandment is temporal.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 267.2*

Still further: It is not a fact that obedience to the commandments of God will invariably bring temporal prosperity. In fact, it is most often the opposite, and has been so from time immemorial. The Psalmist recorded his feeling when he saw the prosperity of the wicked, seeing they were not in trouble as other men were, while the righteous were cast down. Everybody knows that some of the richest men in the world have been profligate, often base, grinding the poor, and have obtained their wealth by the most dishonorable methods, and have trampled upon every principle of right and justice. But let such teaching as that of Colonel Shepard become

generally accepted, and what will be the result? Simply that the possession of great wealth will be taken as an expression of divine favor. The man who is enormously wealthy will be taken as a special favorite of Heaven. Let it be accepted that keeping the commandments necessarily results in worldly prosperity, while a violation of them results in embarrassment and ruin, and there can be no other conclusion but that the man who is rich is the one who is doing right; and so people in estimating his character will not compare his life with the commandments to see if he is obeying them, but will simply measure his bank account; and no matter how vile he has been, or by what unjust methods he may have obtained his wealth, he will be considered righteous. And so we have another indisputable proof that this Sunday movement is unchristian, and tends only to immorality.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 267.3*

We know that in ancient times the idea prevailed that the possession of wealth was a sign of the divine blessing. This idea was firmly fixed in the minds of the ancient Pharisees. So firmly did they believe it that many of them made it the great point in their lives to get wealth, regardless of the means by which it was acquired. And while continually transgressing the divine commandment in acquiring their wealth, they would point to the possession of that wealth as the evidence that they were righteous, and that God loved them. There are Pharisees enough in the world now, but Col. Shepard and the Association to which he belongs are doing their best to make more.*AMS September 18, 1889, page 267.4*

E. J. W.

## October 10, 1889

**“National Reform Bigotry” American Sentinel 4, 36.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman* of August 8, contains a characteristic report from Secretary Gault. He has been circulating through Iowa recently, and in the course of a report of some meetings held at Malvern, we find the following paragraph:—*AMS October 10, 1889, page 285.1*

“The preceding Sabbath I preached twice at Afton, county seat of Union County, in the evening, on the Sabbath-Rest question, at a union service of the Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Evangelical churches. Here there was but one lady, a Seventh-day Adventist, who opposed the petition when it was put to vote of the congregation. She was landlady in the hotel where I lodged, and all day Sabbath her sewing machine hummed with a vim that was significant and unmistakable.”*AMS October 10, 1889, page 285.2*

We mean nothing personal when we say that that is the utterance of a narrow-minded bigot. We simply state a fact. A bigot is one who thinks there is no one in the world of any consequence but himself, that the world was made for him, and that the sun shines principally for his benefit. The only possible inference that can be drawn from Mr. Gault’s remark is that that lady committed an unpardonable act in doing her ordinary work on Sunday while he was in the hotel. The bigotry of the thing may be shown if we turn it around. Suppose that lady, or any individual who conscientiously observes the seventh day of the week as the Sabbath, should chance to stop at a hotel kept by one who observes Sunday, would Mr. Gault think that person ought to cease his ordinary work on that day?*AMS October 10, 1889, page 285.3*

If Mr. Gault were a hotel keeper, and by chance a seventh-day observer should stop over the Sabbath with him, would he have everything stopped in his own house? Of course he would not. It is only when he is around that things must stop. It is his presence that must be regarded. If anyone believes differently from him, that

individual has no right to exist, at least to carry out or act upon his belief This principle is not peculiar to Mr. Gault, although it seems to be very fully developed in him, from what we have seen of his writings. But it is the principle of National Reform to act as though “we are the people, and the government must shape its action to conform to our opinions and to please us. It does not make any difference if other people are discommoded. What does that matter? They have no business to believe differently from what we do.” This is National Reform in a nutshell. It must, from the very nature of the case, make bigots of those who devote themselves to it, no matter how liberal minded they might be by nature.AMS  
*October 10, 1889, page 285.4*

E. J. W.

## October 16, 1889

“Sunday in California and New York” *American Sentinel* 4, 37.

E. J. Waggoner

Mr. Crafts has been in California, the only State in the Union which has no Sunday law; and the people may now expect to have it held up in season and out of season as the terrible example of immorality and vice consequent upon having no Sunday law. In his speeches here he declared that the State had retrograded in religion and morals since the repeal of its Sunday laws six years ago. To be sure Mr. Crafts was not in California six years ago, or before, when they had a Sunday law, and has not been here since that time, with the exception of a few days this year; but that doesn't make any difference with him. *AMS October 16, 1889, page 296.1*

But he does not find it all clear sailing in his endeavor to make capital for Sunday laws at the expense of California. At a meeting of the Congregational club in San Francisco, at which Mr. Crafts was present, the Rev. Dr. Barrows, of that city, said that what Dr. Crafts had said about the moral and religious declension in California was not true; that he had been here eight years, and that in all that time there had been a steady and constant advance in the moral and religious status, and that Dr. Crafts had been here but a few days and could not judge. He protested strongly against Dr. Crafts carrying such a report back to the East, because it was not true. The report of the meeting continues as follows: “Dr. Williams of Tulare City indorsed Dr. Barrows' remarks. The Sabbath was as well observed in Tulare as in any city that he had ever lived in. He was certainly in favor of the workingmen having the privilege of Sunday rest, but for the churches to press Sunday observance on the State, upon religious grounds, and endeavor indirectly to compel men to go to church by strict Sunday laws, could do no good, and might do much harm to the cause of religion. Rev. Dr. Cruzan of the Third Congregational Church, San Francisco, agreed with Dr. Williams and Dr. Barrows. During his recent visit to the East he had spent a Sunday at Coney Island. There was nothing like it for immorality and dissipation on the Pacific Coast; yet this was right under the nose of Dr. Crafts when he was at home, in a State

that had strict Sunday laws.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 296.2*

“Let this be repeated everywhere Mr. Crafts goes. It comes from men who are earnest in their endeavor to get Sunday laws, but who are more interested in truth than in victory. It shows, what the *Alta California* claimed in a recent editorial, that Sunday laws are not necessary for the preservation of morality, and that California without any Sunday law is equal with, and even in advance, morally, of some States that have a stringent Sunday law.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 296.3*

But the point in the above quotation to which we wish to call especial attention is the charge by Dr. Williams, that Sunday laws, such as Mr. Crafts is laboring to secure, are an attempt to compel men to go to church. Mr. Crafts has complained bitterly because we have charged the same thing upon his movement. But here we have a statement to the same effect made by a minister who is engaged with him in an effort to secure a Sunday law, but who does not believe in going to the same length. This is another demonstration that the SENTINEL has not misrepresented the Sunday-law movement. E. J. W.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 296.4*

**“Mr. Small on Church and State” American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

Under the heading, “No Steps Backward,” the *Voice*, in its issue of August 8, had the following:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.1*

In a recent issue of *The Voice*, we called attention to some very foolish things uttered by the AMERICAN SENTINEL, a paper published at Oakland, Cal., which devotes itself to getting up religious bugaboos. It made the childish statement that “work done for party Prohibition is work done to promote the union of Church and State, and to bind the citizens of the United States in a worse slavery than was ever suffered by the negroes,” and then, in reply to our article showing just where the Prohibition party stood, it said:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.2*

“*The Voice* says it has ‘never heard of a prominent Prohibitionist

who favored the union of Church and State.’ Now Mr. Sam. Small is a prominent Prohibitionist—one of the most prominent of Prohibitionists in fact. He was secretary of the National Prohibition Convention of 1888, and he publicly declared this in Kansas City in January of that year:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.3*

“I want to see the day come when the church shall be the arbiter of all legislation, State, national, and municipal; when the great churches of the country can come together harmoniously and issue their edict, and the legislative powers will respect it and enact it into laws.’*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.4*

“If that would not be a union of Church and State, will *The Voice* please tell us what would be? If that would not be a union of Church and State, then there never has been and never can be any such thing as a union of Church and State. Such a thing as that, therefore, being a union of Church and State, and Mr. Sam. Small being a prominent Prohibitionist, it is proved that there is at least one prominent Prohibitionist who favors a union of Church and State.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.5*

Thinking Mr. Small the most competent person to speak for Mr. Small, we inclosed the article to him and asked him to state his opinions on the union of Church and State, which he does as follows:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.6*

“*To The Voice*—The representation of the AMERICAN SENTINEL that I favor a union of Church and State is wholly an invention of the enemy. The extract he quotes from a partial report of a sermon I preached in Kansas City in January, 1888, is sufficiently correct to mislead; not exact enough, however, to convey the thought which I clearly expressed and which, at the time, secured the approval of an audience of thousands, the large majority of which was not made up of ‘third party’ prohibitionists. If the AMERICAN SENTINEL desires to do me and the Prohibition party justice, I can repeat my thoughts as clearly now as I did on the occasion in question.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.7*

“The quotation from my sermon should read as follows:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.8*



“I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital, moral issues. I shall ever hope for and patiently expect the day when legislation, State, national, and municipal, will be projected in harmony with the eternal principle of justice and righteousness, revealed by Christ and proclaimed by his church. Happy will be the day when “righteousness exalts the nation,” when sin is no longer the reproach of our people; when the harmonious judgment of the people of God in America upon the issues of temperance, purity, and uprightness shall be received with respect and enacted into laws; when this people, who owe so much to divine favor, will have no more fellowship with “throne of iniquity,” “which frameth mischief by a law,” and that continually!’*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.9*

“I hold that the above expressions are in perfect harmony with the principles of the National Prohibition party, as expressed in its preamble and platform. There is in them no warrant for any sane man to pronounce me an advocate of the ‘union of Church and State.’ The charge is a device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. At the same time it is a fraud upon the readers of AMERICAN SENTINEL, or a quee confession of the idiocy of its constituency.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.10*

“Yours truly, SAM. W. SMALL.”

If any person’s superstitious fears have been wrought upon by stories of the spooks of the Dark Ages, he may rest assured that the Prohibition party isn’t going to revive any of them. The wheels civilization don’t turn backward.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.11*

The extract referred to was published in thee SENTINEL a long time ago. It was taken from a religious paper, one that could have no interest in misquoting Mr. Small, therefore we were warranted in supposing that it was correct. The SENTINEL has never knowingly misrepresented a single person.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.12*

But in this case we are happy to learn from Mr. Small’s own version that the SENTINEL did not do him any injustice. While he did not

use the exact words that were attributed to him in the report which the SENTINEL quoted, he did use language which conveys all that we drew from what we supposed were the exact words. Said he, "I want to see the day come in the history of our country when the voice of the church of Christ will be heard and respected upon all vital moral issues." Mr. Small will not deny that his idea was that the voice of the church should be heard and respected not simply by men as individuals, but by men as grouped together in political parties, and by men as statesmen, judges, etc. Now we say that when that time does come, we shall have a union of Church and State as surely as such a thing ever existed. It will simply be the church dictating, and we say the church has no right to be heard and respected by political parties as such. In the darkest of the Dark Ages, when Church and State union was at its height, the case was simply that the voice of the church was heard and respected by the State. The church dictated the policy of the State.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 298.13*

Bishop Vincent says most emphatically that the church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position and to influence temporal power. Said he, "All the church wants is spiritual power, and the only influence it has any right to have is the influence it may have with individuals as individuals." Mr. Small is doubtless perfectly sincere and honest in his disavowal of any union of Church and State. It would seem that he simply wants the church to assume its rightful prerogative. That is all that Cardinal Woolsey or Pope Hildebrand ever desired. The great trouble with them was that they were mistaken in regard to the church's rightful position. That is the trouble with Mr. Small. We see no reason, after a careful reading of Mr. Small's own statement of his position in his sermon, to withdraw our statement that he is really in favor of a union of Church and State.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.1*

And this charge is no device of desperation to compass an argument against the Prohibition party. The SENTINEL has no fight with the Prohibition party upon its prohibition principles. We have to do simply with those Prohibitionists who, like Mr. Small, would use the Prohibition party as a religious machine. We are thankful to know that there are many in the party who have no sympathy with any such movement.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.2*

As to Mr. Small's insinuation against the readers of the AMERICAN SENTINEL, we have only to say that they number many thousands in every part of the United States, consisting chiefly of professional men, doctors, lawyers, judges, members of State Legislatures, ministers of the gospel, as well as laboring men; and Mr. Small will not enhance his own popularity by wholesale charges of idiocy against our country's best citizens.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.3*

As to the statement of the *Voice*, that the AMERICAN SENTINEL spends its time in getting up religious bugaboos, we will only say that there is no need for us to work in that line so long as the *Voice*, while professedly working for prohibition, actually makes that secondary to religious legislation. The SENTINEL lays no claim to being an inventor; it simply exposes the inventions of others.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.4*

E. J. W.

**"Sunday Closing Not a Temperance Measure" American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

In our opposition to Sunday laws we have frequently been charged with working in the interests of the liquor traffic. Many claim, and we do not doubt but a great majority of them think, that the enactment of a rigid Sunday law would be in the interest of temperance. We have always denied this, and we think have demonstrated it many times. It was only recently that we published a short article on this point in the SENTINEL, in answer to the criticism of a sub-scriber. We are glad now to be able to present a definite statement on this point from a temperance worker who is also an ardent advocate of the Sunday law. The *New York Voice* of August 22 contains the experience of a pastor residing in Crete, New York. From some statements in his letter we think he is a Congregationalist. In the course of his article, which is a strong prohibition utterance, he says:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.5*

"The saloon keepers of this place have not sold openly on the Sabbath to any great extent. That the Sunday restriction has its

merits as a Sabbath-observance measure is true, and as such it should secure a strict enforcement. As a temperance measure it has little merit. It is just as practicable to get the Sunday supply of whisky or beer as of steak or roast. When the Omaha mayor a few weeks ago began shutting up the Sunday saloon in that city, men had a dry and dreadful time for the first Sunday under that policy. They had not dreamed it to be a serious purpose of the mayor. They were not caught a second Sunday, however; they got an abundant supply the Saturday before. The entire traffic can be carried on in six *days*, the only objection being that it is a little less convenient to get and keep over the Sunday supply.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.6*

We hope the *Voice* will not be accused of working in the interest of the saloon, because it published this statement. We believe in prohibition, but we are strongly opposed to prohibition, so called, only one day in the week. But we are in favor of it three hundred and sixty-five days in the year. We say that the Sunday-closing movement not only has no value whatever as a temperance measure, but that it is a strong prop to the liquor traffic, in that it tends to make it respectable. This it does by placing it on a level with all other lines of business and making it legitimate. Let us illustrate:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.7*

A good, conscientious woman who on Sunday morning sees her little boy playing ball, says, “Johnny, you should not play ball on Sunday. You must not do that.” What idea would Johnny get from his mother’s words? Would he say, “Mother says it is not right to play ball”?—No. He would say, “Mother says it is not right to play ball on Sunday, but it is right to play ball on other days.” Suppose she sees her boy smoking a cigar on Sunday, and, of course, does not want him to smoke, would she say, “Johnny, don’t you know that you ought not to smoke cigars on Sunday?” Would not the boy get the idea from that that it was not wrong for him to smoke cigars, but that it was simply wrong to smoke on Sunday? He could get no other idea. But, no; it is wrong, and it hurts her boy, no matter on what day it is done, and she does not want him to smoke at all, Sunday or any other day.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.8*

The special point that we would leave with our readers is this, that

any of them who are inclined to oppose Sunday laws, yet who have been hesitating because they were temperance men, need hesitate no longer. The Sunday-closing movement and the temperance movement have nothing in common.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 299.9*

E. J. W.

**“The Petition and the Inquisition” American Sentinel 4, 38.**

E. J. Waggoner

The supplement to the March monthly document of the American Sabbath Union was devoted to a statement of how the friends of the Sunday might co-operate with the union. Following an extract from the constitution, which states that the object of the union is “to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship,” there was an earnest appeal to every individual to push the petitions for a Sunday law, making not the least abatement because Congress had adjourned. The following form of petition, was suggested: —*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.1*

“The undersigned organizations and adult residents of the United States, twenty-one years of age or more, earnestly petition you to pass a bill forbidding in the government’s mail and military service and in inter-state commerce, and in the District of Columbia and the Territories, all Sunday traffic and work, except works of necessity and mercy, and such private work by those who religiously and regularly observe another day of the week by abstaining from labor and business, as will neither interfere with the general rest nor with public worship.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.2*

We claim that this petition alone furnishes ample proof that the American Sabbath Union contemplates a union of Church and State in the fullest sense, and is providing-unconsciously it may be, but none the less surely-for the establishment of the Inquisition. Strange as it may seem to some, we find the strongest proof of this in the proposed exemption of those that observe another day.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.3*

The workers for a Sunday law lay a great deal of stress on the fact that they make such an exception. In his speech before the Senate Committee, Mr. Crafts spoke of the exception that is made to the Seventh-day Baptists by the laws of Rhode Island, allowing them to carry on public industries on the first day of the week, and said that “the tendency of Legislatures and executive officers towards those who claim to keep a Saturday Sabbath is to over-leniency rather than, over-strictness.” *AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.4*

In the same hearing Mrs. Bateham spoke of the exemption that was asked for in the petition, stating that they would like to exempt Seventh-day keepers from the penalties of the law for which they asked, providing it could be done, but that if such an exemption would work, against the general enforcement of the law then they did not wish it. These statements show that they simply regard themselves as making a great concession when they do not persecute people who rest upon Saturday. Dr. Bothwell, of Oakland, Cal., stated their reeling very well when he said: *AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.5*

“Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath, if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business, as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors.” *AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.6*

With these statements compare the following from the first chapter of Dr. Schaff's work on “The Progress of Religious Freedom, as Shown in the History of Toleration Acts.” Says he:—*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.7*

“An edict or act of toleration is a grant of the civil government, which authorizes religious societies dissenting from the State religion to worship according to the dictates of conscience without liability to persecution. Such an edict always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship. Toleration may proceed from

necessity, or from prudence, or from indifference, or from liberality and an enlarged view of truth and right. It may be extended or withdrawn by the government; but it is usually the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.8*

“There is a wide difference between toleration and liberty. The one is a concession, the other a right; the one is a matter of expediency, the other a principle; the one is a gift of man, the other a gift of God.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.9*

“Toleration implies more or less censure or disapproval. We tolerate or endure what we dislike or cannot prevent. The most despotic governments are tolerant towards subjects who are too numerous or too useful to be killed or exiled. Russia tolerates Romanists, Protestants, Jews, and Mohammedans; Turkey tolerates ‘Christian dogs,’ and likes them to prey upon each other; but woe to him in either country who apostatizes from the State religion, or attempts to induce any member of the same to apostasy. Toleration is first sought and granted as a favor, then demanded and conceded as a right, and at last spurned as an insult. In a free country nobody wants to be tolerated for his religious opinions or sacred convictions.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.10*

“Religious liberty is a natural, fundamental, and inalienable right of every man. It is founded on the sacredness of conscience, which is the voice of God in man, and above the reach and control of human authority. There is a law above all human laws. It is written, not on parchment and tables of stone, but on the heart of man by the finger of God. It is that law which commands with the categorical imperative, and which filled the philosopher Kant with ever-growing reverence and awe. ‘We must obey God more than man.’ He and he alone is the Author and Lord of conscience, and no power on earth has a right to interpose itself between them. ‘Every man stands or falls to his own Lord.’ Liberty of conscience requires liberty of worship as its manifestation. To grant the former and to deny the latter is to imprison conscience and to promote hypocrisy or infidelity. Religion is in its nature voluntary, and ceases to be religion in proportion as it is forced. God, wants free worshipers, and no others.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.11*

“Toleration is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. Persecution results from the union of Church and State; toleration, from a relaxation of that union; full religious liberty and legal equality require a peaceful separation of the spiritual and secular powers.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 305.12*

Note particularly what he says of toleration, that it is an intermediate state between religious persecution and religious liberty. He says also that it is usually “the entering wedge for religious liberty and legal equality.” This is true, providing it has been preceded by despotic intolerance. If a government has rigidly persecuted everyone who dissents from the established religion, then an act of toleration would be the entering wedge toward religious liberty—a step toward freedom; but if perfect liberty and equality have been enjoyed by the citizens of a government, then an act of toleration would be a long stride toward the taking away of religious freedom. For an act of toleration, as Dr. Schaff truly says, “Always presupposes a religion established by law and supported by the State, and the right of the State to control public worship.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 306.1*

The very fact of exemptions being thought of in a law—the use of the word concession and toleration—shows the existence of a despotic law; so that the more the Sunday-law advocates talk about “concessions, the more they boast of their leniency, the more they press their petition for a Sunday law which shall exempt those who religiously and regularly observe another day, the more they proclaim the fact that they are working for a State religion. Now, whenever a religion, or any form of religion, is established by the State, the Inquisition and persecution must inevitably follow. For in such a case an offense against the established religion is an offense against the State; and of course the State is bound to punish all who violate its laws. But punishment by the State for differences of opinion, or of acts in matters of religion, is persecution.”*AMS October 16, 1889, page 306.2*

Note particularly the petition which we quoted. It provides for the exemption of those who “religiously and regularly” observe another day of the week. How, in the face of this, it is possible for the framers and advocates of that petition to claim that they are not



working for a State religion, it is impossible for us to conceive. That petition lays the foundation for the Inquisition; and if a law should be passed in harmony with it, the Inquisition would have to be established. How can the State tell who do and who do not religiously observe another day? Anyone can see that the petition plans for the State to inquire, not simply into a man's religious or irreligious acts, but into the motives of his acts. Of course it is well understood that under all circumstances there are people who have a form of religion, people who do certain things professedly in the name of religion, yet from selfish motives. Now if a law is passed in accordance with this petition, the State through its officers would be obliged to inquire into the motives which prompt a man's rest upon Saturday. No individual will have any guarantee that he will remain unmolested for a week. He may be brought up at any time at the instigation of any bigot or any person who has a fancied grudge towards him, and put under examination as to whether or not he observes another day from religious motives. And the worst of it all will be that in such examination his own testimony will avail nothing. Of course those who do observe the day religiously would say so; and any who are not conscientious in their observance of the day would, in order to escape the penalty, declare that they observed it religiously. And so whether or not a person were cleared would depend upon the testimony of men who might have bitter prejudice toward him.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 306.3*

We believe that every thoughtful, candid individual can see that to work for this petition is to work directly for as wicked a persecution as ever existed on earth. Let those who see this point use all their energy in setting the light clearly before others, in order that they may not be deceived by the specious arguments of those who are working for the Sunday law. To every individual that petition will be presented, and many will be misled by its outward pretention to justice and of caring for the rights of a minority, unaware that in this very concession is the strongest proof of the wicked character of the proposed law.*AMS October 16, 1889, page 306.4*

E. J. W.

## October 30, 1889

**“The American Sabbath Union and Human Rights” American Sentinel 4, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

In Dr. Herrick Johnson’s address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, as published in the March *Monthly Document* of that association, there are four propositions laid down concerning the Sunday newspaper, the last of which we shall give special notice. Quoting from an Illinois Supreme Court Report, he says:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.1*

“Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.2*

This proposition is self-evident, and needs no discussion. No one would uphold it more strenuously than would the editors of the AMERICAN SENTINEL. But there are some questions that we would like to ask, to find out the idea of the Sunday-law advocates upon the subject of human rights. Suppose a man does not wish to exercise his right to rest on the first day of the week; what then? Must he be forced to exercise it? Will he be compelled to rest, whether he wishes to or not? If he is to be, then it is demonstrated that the law does not contemplate the protection of Sunday observance as a man’s right, but the enforcement of it as a duty. Governments are organized for the protection of people’s rights, not for the purpose of compelling them to exercise their rights, for it is considered self-evident, as a law of nature, that no man will need to be compelled to assert his own rights.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.3*

Another point that should not be passed lightly by is this: How extensive an idea of human right have these Sunday-law advocates? Do they mean to imply that every man has a right to the enjoyment of a Sabbath rest whenever he chooses to take it, and on whatever day he chooses to rest? or do they mean to limit that right to a certain day? Do they mean that every man has a right to

be protected in the enjoyment of rest only on Sunday? This we should infer from the proposition, which plainly implies that a person has no right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on any other day. If they say that a man has a right to the undisturbed enjoyment of rest on the seventh day of the week, then they deprive themselves of all argument for a Sunday law; and if they say that a man has not a right to rest upon Saturday, they thereby confess that their proposed law is a law against the rights of conscience; for it is well known that those people do conscientiously rest upon the seventh day. This is just what they mean.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.4*

That their movement for a National Sunday law is a movement to the effect that no one has any rights except those who keep Sunday, is evident from the following. It has been quoted many times before in the SENTINEL, and it doubtless will be quoted many times again, unless National Reform Sunday-law advocates specifically repudiate it. It is from Dr. Edwards' speech at the New York National Reform Convention. He says:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.5*

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would a poor lunatic, for in my view he is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.6*

And later he exclaims, “Tolerate atheism, sir? there is nothing out of hell that I would not tolerate as soon.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.7*

And what is Dr. Edwards' idea of an atheist? Following is his own statement, in the save lecture:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.8*

“The atheist is a man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.9*

“The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he

manifests himself and his will in a revelation.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.10*

“The Jew admits God, providence, and revelation, but rejects the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ as sheer imagination, or-worse-sheer imposture.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.11*

“The seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.12*

“These all are, for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class. They use the same arguments and the same tactics against us. They must be counted together, which we very much regret, but which we cannot help. The first-named is the leader in the discontent and in the outcry,—the atheist, to whom nothing is higher or more sacred than man, and nothing survives the tomb. It is his class. Its labors are almost wholly in his interest; its success would be almost wholly his triumph. The rest are adjuncts to him in this contest. They must be named from him; they must be treated as, for this question, one party.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.13*

That is, the man who differs with the majority as to the exact day to be observed, the man who conscientiously observes the seventh day, because the Bible says so, instead of the first, concerning which the Bible says nothing, is classed as an atheist; and it is plainly declared that an atheist is not to be tolerated, except as a lunatic would be tolerated. A lunatic is allowed to run at large so long as he is quiet; but as soon as his mania takes an aggressive form, he is shut up. Dr. Edwards regards the keeping of the seventh day as evidence of an unsound mind. So long as the individual should say nothing about it, he might perhaps be considered a harmless lunatic; but whenever the observer of the seventh day should begin to promulgate his faith, and openly teach others that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and persuade them to accept it, he would be raving, and, therefore, would be shut up and treated as a

conspirator.AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.14

In the *Christian Statesman* of July 7, 1887, it is positively denied that atheists, among whom it will be remembered Christians who keep the seventh day are classed, have "any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions, and privileges at all." Thus it is plainly seen that the success of this National Sunday-law movement means the depriving of a large number of the citizens of the United States of the rights of conscience.AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.15

Let it be understood that whatever right any man has is bestowed upon him by God himself. Human rights are not bestowed by civil government. All that civil governments are instituted for is to protect men in the enjoyment of rights which God has given them. The Declaration of Independence, which has justly been called the charter of American liberties, declares that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This means that every individual is equal, with respect to the rights with which God has endowed him. Now, while we have heard National Reformers and the president of the American Sabbath Union rail against the Constitution, we have never yet heard an American, or any other person, for that matter, find fault with the Declaration of Independence. That document voiced a truth as sure as any statement of holy writ. God has given to every man the same right; if ninety-nine per cent. of the people in any country have a certain right, the other one per cent. have the same right. But the American Sabbath Union is organized for the express purpose of protecting one class in the enjoyment of certain rights, and the depriving of another class of the same rights. In other words, it is organized for the express purpose of overthrowing the work done by the founders of this government. It is distinctively un-American. Nothing is surer than that its work is the exact opposite of the work of the immortal framers of the Declaration of Independence; and therefore since their work was to secure to this land perfect liberty, its work has for its sole object the overthrow of American liberty. It seems as though this demonstration must be clear to every individual.AMS October 30, 1889, page 313.16

It will be said that those who are thus discriminated against and deprived of equal rights with others are only a few. Thus Dr. Edwards, in the same speech from which we have quoted, said:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 314.1*

“The parties whose conscience we are thus charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right, but the fact remains, and is worthy of note, that, taken altogether, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship. They are not even as many as those among us who do not speak the English language.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 314.2*

Mr. Crafts, in his speech before the Senate Committee, spoke of “the one or two small sects of Christians who worship on Saturday.” And after speaking of the difficulties that rise in exempting them from the penalties of the Sunday law, contemptuously dismisses them in the following words:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 314.3*

“Infinitely less harm is done by the usual policy, the only constitutional or sensible one, to let the insignificantly small minority of less than one in a hundred, whose religious convictions require them to rest on Saturday (unless their work is of a private character such as the law allows them to do on Sunday), suffer the loss of one day’s wages rather than have the other ninety-nine suffer by the wrecking of the Sabbath by public business.”*AMS October 30, 1889, page 314.4*

Many times have we heard Sunday-law lecturers pass the consideration of the fact that their law would cause seventh-day observers to suffer, with the statement that such people constitute only about seven-tenths of one per cent. of the population, and that therefore they were too insignificant to be noticed. Perhaps they may think so; but such expressions show that they do not understand what they are doing. It is not a question of whether a few people who observe Saturday will be injured or not, but whether the government can afford to adopt the principle that minorities have no rights. If that principle is adopted, it will not be limited in its application to observers of the seventh day. It may seem very fine for the majority on any question of opinion to decide that those who

differ with them have no rights; but they should remember that majorities sometimes change. This question of Sunday law will determine whether a man's life or property is safe in this country. If the government lends itself to a scheme which will be unjust to a single individual, then nobody has any assurance that injustice will not be done him. If the rights of a few people may be trampled upon because they keep the seventh day, the rights of some other people may be trampled upon because they differ with the majority on some other question. If in this country the principle of trampling upon human rights is once adopted, nobody can tell where it will stop. We are not alarmists, but we have no hesitation in saying that if the government follows the course marked out for it by the American Sabbath Union, the scenes of the French Revolution will be re-enacted in this country. It cannot be otherwise.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 314.5*

E. J. W.

**"How is This?" American Sentinel 4, 40.**

E. J. Waggoner

On Tuesday evening, October 1, the Prohibitionists of Nashville, Tenn., met in convention to nominate a city ticket, and adopted resolutions, a part of which are as follows:—*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.1*

WHEREAS, We, Prohibitionists of the city of Nashville, in convention assembled, have unshaken confidence in the wisdom of that action by which a political party has been organized for the accomplishment of an object more important than any other offered to our consideration as a free people, to wit, the prohibition of the beverage liquor traffic by State and national law, as the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors are the constant and fruitful source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness, producing degradation and crime, robbing women and children, and in ways manifold and extreme perverting the blessings of free institutions,*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.2*

*Resolved*, That the prohibition of the liquor traffic should be the

dominating and dividing political issue until such prohibition shall have become the recognized and settled policy of the government.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.3*

*Resolved*, That the policy of prohibition, because of the scope of its economic and social relations, and the largeness of its connection with civil liberty, should be embodied in the organic law of the States and the United States, as a safeguard of enlarged social life, which is the basis of all stable and prosperous government.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.4*

*Resolved*, That the American Sunday, in the interest of public order and morality, should be zealously guarded, and we hereby arraign and condemn the municipal authorities of the city of Nashville for the non-enforcement of law against Sunday tippling.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.5*

*Resolved*, That as Prohibitionists we heartily indorse and support the recent protest of citizens of Nashville against Sunday tippling, and proffer cordial co-operation with them in their patriotic and lawful efforts to enforce the law against its violators, and in the enforcement of all other laws.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 315.6*

Our third-party friends who think that if we would demonstrate our temperance principles we should by all means support the Prohibition ticket, seek to allay our fears by saying that the Prohibition party has nothing to do with Sunday laws. We would like to have them explain this resolution, and tell us whether or not the Prohibitionists of Nashville are in harmony with the party at large.*AMS October 30, 1889, page 316.1*

We cannot understand how the mention of Sunday in the connection that it comes in these resolutions, has anything to do with temperance. The first resolution says that the sale of intoxicating liquors is the "source of physical, intellectual, and moral unsoundness;" that it produces degradation and crime; and therefore they believe in prohibiting it. Very good; but if they do actually believe in prohibiting it, why do they need to specify their protest against Sunday tippling, and their determination to enforce the prohibition of liquor on Sunday? If they are really Prohibitionists, as we have always understood the term, that would include the



stopping of the sale of liquor on Sunday as well as on all other days. But if their movement involves something less than the complete suppression of the liquor traffic,—if, as their reference to Sunday implies, they will be at least in a measure content with the suppression of the sale of liquor on Sunday,—how can they harmonize that with the terrible arraignment of the liquor traffic in the first resolution? It seems to us that there is insincerity somewhere, or else a compounding of crime. Will some third-party friend inform us why it is necessary to specify Sunday tippling in resolutions declaiming against any sale whatever of liquor?*AMS October 30, 1889, page 316.2*

E. J. W.

**November 6, 1889**

**“Is the Constitution Infidel?” American Sentinel 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of August says that the statement that the American government was established on the secular principle, is untrue. It says that to represent the National Reform movement as revolutionary is to forget, or intentionally ignore, the plainest facts of history. It says that the government is Christian, but overturns this in the same short article by saying: “We admit that infidelity stole a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and we admit that, largely through the unsettling influences of that instrument, the relation of government to religion has become an open question, now in process of settlement, in this country. But the claim that the secular theory is the established American theory is false and unfair, and, like all unfair attempts in controversy, will yet bring confusion to those who make it.”*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.3*

To the covert threat in this last clause we have nothing to say. But we would like to ask the *Statesman* what it is that determines the character of the government, if it is not the Constitution. If, as it admits, the Constitution of the United States is a secular document, then the American theory of government must be the secular theory of government. And therefore the unfairness is wholly on its own part, in claiming that the American theory of government is to combine religion with the government, when, according to its own admission, such a claim is a false one. Whatever confusion results, must necessarily come to those who make such false claims.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.4*

But mark, that while we say the American theory of government is the secular theory, we do not at all admit the *Statesman*’s charge that it is an infidel theory. Infidelity did not steal a march on the American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, and that document is not an infidel document, it does not teach infidelity. It has no tendency whatever towards infidelity. To show the falsity of the statement that infidelity stole a march on the

American people in the framing of the Constitution of the United States, it is only necessary to say that there were religious men in the Constitutional Convention, and serious consideration was given to the matter of recognizing God and religion in the Constitution; and the omission of such recognition was the result of careful, deliberate, conscientious consideration. This is more clearly apparent from the fact that within two years after the Constitution was adopted, ten amendments were added, the first of which is the following: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." If the omission of the name of God, or the recognition of religion, was an oversight, the, first amendment, instead of declaring against an establishment of religion, would have provided for it. Nay; the original Constitution itself declared that no religious test should ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.5*

But the fact that God's name is not mentioned does not make the Constitution an infidel Constitution, any more than the fact that a merchant's sign or his advertisement in the newspaper does not contain the name of God proves that he is an infidel. The Postmaster-General, John Wanamaker, is the pride of the National Reform party, although perhaps not a member of that organization. He is pointed to with pride as the Christian merchant. We have no disposition to question his Christianity; but we would simply call attention to the fact that in all his extensive advertisements the name of God does not occur once. Are we to judge from that that he is an infidel? His clerks transact his business and sell goods over the counter without making any mention of the name of God. Does that show that his business is an infidel business? Nobody thinks so. On the contrary, if he should flaunt the name of God in his advertisements, and if he should instruct his clerks to make some mention of God with every yard of cotton or silk that they tore off, the people would justly question the genuineness of his profession.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.6*

In his book, "Church and State in the States," Dr. Schaff speaks as follows concerning the proposed amendment recognizing God in the Constitution:—*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.7*

“Our chief objection to such an amendment, besides its impracticability, is that it rests upon a false assumption, and casts an unjust reflection upon the original document, as if it were hostile to religion. But it is neither hostile nor friendly to any religion; it is simply silent on the subject, as lying beyond the jurisdiction of the general government. The absence of the names of God and Christ, in a purely political and legal document, no more proves denial or irreverence than the absence of those names in a mathematical treatise, or the statutes of a bank or railroad corporation. The title ‘holiness’ does not make the Pope of Rome any holier than he is, and it makes the contradiction only more glaring in such characters as Alexander VI. The book of Esther and the Song of Solomon are undoubtedly productions of devout worshipers of Jehovah; and yet the name of God does not occur once in them.”*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.8*

According to the National Reform view, the book of Esther and the Song of Solomon would be called infidel documents. But of all who talk about infidelity, the National Reformers show the least knowledge of what infidelity is; and this for the reason that they have the least knowledge of what constitutes Christianity.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 316.9*

E. J. W.

**“The Christian Statesman in Favor of Church and State Union” American Sentinel 4, 41.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of August 29 the AMERICAN SENTINEL 18 described as chronically unfair, in that it charges the National Reform Association with working for a union of Church and State. There are two noticeable things in connection with this controversy. The first is that the *Statesman* has never yet attempted to prove that it is not in favor of Church and State; it simply denies the charges. This would be all that is required, if our charges consisted simply of assertions; but when we cite facts, and make arguments, and draw conclusions, to show that it is in favor of Church and State union, they have never yet attempted to show the fallacy of one of

the arguments, or to disprove one of the conclusions. And the other noticeable thing is that the *Statesman* scarcely ever makes a denial of its desire for Church and State union without in that same denial furnishing proof that it is desirous of such a union. In this very article it says:—*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.1*

“We hold as strenuously as do our opponents to the absolute separation and independence of Church and State, but we also hold, with Professor Leiber, that the theory of American institutions requires the total separation of the State from the Church—not from religion.”*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.2*

As Dr. Edwards said in the New York convention, they believe in a union of religion and State, but not in Church and State. Now if that were true, it would seem to be proof that they do not believe in religion in the church; and surely that admission must be worse than the other; for a church without religion is a deplorable thing. We are, however, convinced that the National Reformers do not believe in religion in the church, from the very fact that they believe in religion and the State, that is, in making the State the Church; for when this is done there will be no religion in it—only an empty shell.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.3*

But on the first page of the same paper, the *Statesman* shows in an editorial that it is the champion of the union of Church and State. It notes the call for the annual congress of the American Secular Union for 1889, and publishes a statement of the object of that union, which object is to secure the total separation of Church and State. After quoting this declaration of principles, the *Statesman* says:—*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.4*

“We cheerfully and zealously assist in giving publicity to this call. Nothing could give the American people a clearer view of the pending situation than these frank, logical, and comprehensive demands of the American Secular Union.”*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.5*

The *Statesman* recognizes itself as the direct antagonist of the object of the American Secular Union; we do not say the antagonist of the infidel views of its members, but the antagonist of the work of the association. Therefore, it declares itself to be the champion of a

union of Church and State.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 323.6*

This is still further shown by the fact that the Statesman is one of the most virulent opposers of the petition which has been circulated asking Congress to pass no laws which would look toward a union of Church and State. It is no use for the Statesman to try to conceal its motives. It would be much more honorable for it to boldly avow its advocacy of Church and State union. As it says, nothing can be gained by persistent misrepresentation. It might as well declare the real object of the National Reform Association; for it cannot make a denial of that object without in that very denial revealing it. E. J. W.*AMS November 6, 1889, page 324.1*

## November 13, 1889

“Their Object” *American Sentinel* 4, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

The following paragraph is from a paper on “The American Sabbath,” read at the Ocean Grove Convention, August 9, by Dr. Robert S. Doherty, formerly assistant editor of the *New York Christian Advocate*. He said:—*AMS November 13, 1889, page 330.1*

“The Sunday newspaper, as published in our chief cities, is a peculiarly American institution. It could not be supported by its foreign patronage, nor, for that matter, without Christian patronage. It is directly hostile to the Sabbath. Now the most serious aspect of this Sunday paper business is not so much the fact that a few journeymen printers are engaged after midnight on Saturday, or that the fast train carries the edition with great speed, and with more or less disturbance, out into the remote parts of the country. The chief mischief is done in the reading of the paper. For this there is no excuse. For the harm which comes from it, the reader is himself responsible.”*AMS November 13, 1889, page 330.2*

In this short paragraph we have again revealed to us the real object of Sunday laws,—they are not so much for the purpose of prohibiting all labor on the first day of the week, as for the purpose of inducing men to go to church by cutting off all other means of spending the day. From this and similar utterances, we are warranted in the conclusion that if all the people would faithfully attend church every Sunday there would not be so much objection raised to the work which is done outside of church hours.*AMS November 13, 1889, page 330.3*

This is not an isolated utterance. Everyone who fights the Sunday newspaper makes the same statement. When told that more work is done on Sunday in preparing the Monday paper than in preparing the Sunday morning edition, they say that the Sunday work that is done by the newspaper employees is not the evil against which they strike; but that what they are concerned about is the fact that the

newspapers keep people away from the church and destroy the effect of the sermon on those who do go. Thus they show that they are working not so much in the interest of Sunday rest as in the interest of the pulpit. We wish to emphasize this point until our readers see that this Sunday movement is nothing more nor less than an effort on the part of the churches to have the State legislate in their behalf.*AMS November 13, 1889, page 330.4*

But this is not all that is shown; the paragraph just quoted shows the seemingly utter inability of the advocates of Sunday laws to comprehend the fact that the State does not possess the same power that the Spirit of God does. They want the State to pass laws to suppress a thing the evil of which, they themselves confess, rests solely with the individual. It is not a public nuisance-not something which, like the saloon, tends only to destroy the well-being of society; for whatever mischief is done, the individual reader is himself alone responsible. Yet they expect that the State is going to remedy this evil; they expect that the State, by taking away the news-paper, will make the individual who now reads it spiritually-minded. They do not seem to understand that the lack of spirituality is what leads professed Christians to read these papers when they should be engaged in worship; and that if the newspapers were taken away, their carnal minds would find some other worldly means of gratification. If they would think of the matter seriously, they could but confess that the suppression of the Sunday newspaper would not in the slightest degree increase the spirituality of the people; and that admission would at the same time be a confession that they are more interested in having people possess *a form* of godliness than in laboring through the divinely-appointed agencies to really convert them; in other words, that they have lost sight of the gospel. And so it is no doubt true that while National Reformers have so much to say about atheism on the part of those who oppose Sunday laws, they themselves are most zealously working to undermine true Christianity.*AMS November 13, 1889, page 330.5*

E. J. W.



## November 20, 1889

**“The Principles of Constitutional Recognition of God” American Sentinel 4, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Christian Statesman* of September 5, R. C. Wylie gives quite a lengthy report of the discussion of the proposal to acknowledge God in the constitution of the new State of Washington, which is quite interesting. There were some things said which show that some of the members had the right idea as to the relation of Church and State. When the convention went into committee of the whole to consider the preamble and bill of rights, the following preamble was read:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.1*

“We, the people of the State of Washington, to preserve our rights, do ordain this constitution.”*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.2*

Immediately one of the members moved to substitute the following:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.3*

“We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to almighty God for our freedom, to secure and transmit the same unimpaired to succeeding generations, do ordain this constitution.”*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.4*

The mover of this substitute afterward withdrew it in favor of the following, after it had been read:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.5*

“We, the people of Washington, in order to form more independent and perfect government, ... profoundly grateful to almighty God, for this inestimable right, and invoking his favor and guidance, do ordain and establish the following constitution and form of government for the State of Washington.”*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.6*

The discussion was on the adoption of this, instead of the simple preamble first read. Mr. Comegys, of Whitman, made a strong speech upon this, the force of which Mr. Wylie attempts to break

down by a slur upon the personal appearance of the speaker, who said:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.7*

I am opposed to the substitute. The gentleman is in favor of it, because he thinks we ought to be grateful to almighty God. I would like to ask him if he thinks this provision would add anything to our gratitude by being in that preamble. He admitted the necessity for brevity, and has made it as brief, he says, as he could and include that point. Now, as I understand it, Mr. President, this has nothing to do with gratitude, or reverence, or irreverence. A man may be very reverent or very grateful, without lifting up his voice on the street corners, or he may lift up his voice and claim to be very grateful and yet not be grateful. The question is, Shall we advertise it in this way? Has it anything to do, here? The framers of the Constitution of the United States had this matter under advisement, and after mature deliberation (and many framers of the Constitution were devout Christians), they deemed it not wise to have any reference to the Deity, because they had agreed that Church and State and matters of religion should forever be separate from civil government. Now, what object is to be attained? Will we be more grateful by reason of putting it there? or will we be less ungrateful, notwithstanding we put it there?"*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.8*

We say that this is sound. Gratitude is shown rather by acts than by words. The people of Washington might all of them be profoundly grateful to God, and yet make no statement of it in their Constitution; and on the other hand; they might make a profession of gratitude in their Constitution, and have none in their hearts. Now, which would be the better condition?—Manifestly, to be grateful, and not to advertise it in the Constitution; that would be far better than to proclaim it from the capitol, and not possess it.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.9*

But there is another point to consider. If that were stated in the Constitution, would it tell the truth? Are the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy?—No doubt some of them are; but the most zealous National Reformer will not claim that all of them are. Are even a majority of the people of Washington grateful to God for the blessings which they enjoy? The

people of Washington are doubtless as good as the people of any other section of the United States; but it cannot be denied that only a small minority of people in the United States, or in any individual State, have any real gratitude to God. It is not going beyond bounds to say that the majority of the people scarcely ever think of him. The entire church membership of the United States is less than one-fourth the population, that is, less than one-fourth of the people of the United States make any profession of, or belief in, a gratitude to God; and the declarations of leading ministers and religious journals are to the effect that the churches themselves are lamentably deficient in godliness; that thousands of church members are in no respect different from the professed ungodly. This being the admitted fact, it is manifest that for the people of any State, or of the United States, to put in their Constitution a statement that they were grateful to God would be to make their Constitution state a falsehood. If that preamble were adopted which says, "We, the people of Washington, grateful to almighty God," etc., the constitution would be a lie upon its very face. Certainly no good can be accomplished by falsehood. Truth cannot come from evil. Placing the acknowledgment of God in the constitution would not make a single individual more grateful to God than he now is. Therefore, for people to adopt a constitution with such a statement would be a positive wrong. People who know nothing about God would imagine themselves to be grateful to him, simply because they had subscribed to a constitution which said that they were grateful. So the constitution, instead of making people better, would have a tendency to confirm them in their ungodliness.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 337.10*

One of the speakers in favor of the substitution was a Mr. Cosgrove. He started out by saying that the effort to have such a preamble was not an attempt to connect the Church and the State. He said: "It does not in any way associate the Church and State because of this recognition of God. It is not necessarily recognizing the Church in any sense." And then he went on to disprove this statement, by saying: "We expect to get a large amount of immigration into this country before many years, and I do not care what the committee intended by leaving it out of this preamble, the masses of the United States will take it as an indirect attack upon the church, and as an indirect pandering to infidelity by leaving out

this word.” This statement of his shows conclusively that the substitution would in a way connect Church and State, although it is not true that the omitting of the substitution would be an attack upon the church. Anyone can see that to adopt a constitution which says nothing about the Deity or the church, could not be considered an attack upon the church any more than a bank corporation could be said to be making an attack upon the church if it adopted articles of corporation without making any reference to the Deity.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.1*

Mr. Cosgrove said further: “Let me say, gentlemen, that this territory would have been built up long ago had it not been that the people of the East believed that Washington Territory was a heathen land, peopled with heathens, without government.” That statement shows the hollowness of the whole thing; the recognition of God in the constitution was designed simply as an advertising scheme, to induce immigration. But what nonsense to suppose that people would settle in the Territory any quicker because its constitution contained the name of God. Did the speaker suppose that the people of the East are so ignorant that they could be duped into supposing that the insertion of the name of God in the constitution would make the people any better? Would they imagine that the inhabitants of the State were all pious, simply because of a few words in the constitution? The idea is absurd.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.2*

Mr. Warner, chairman of the Preamble Committee, said that he would yield to no one in reverence for God, but likened the placing of his name in the constitution to the action of the Pharisee in the Scriptures. He did not believe it was needed any more than the Lord’s prayer. This is true, as we have already shown. The adoption of such a preamble would simply be a piece of Phariseism, and that in reality is all that was expected. Mr. Cosgrove’s argument showed that it was designed simply to advertise to the people of the world that the people of Washington were religious, although the statement would not represent the truth. Mr. Sullivan, of Tacoma, showed the sophistry of Mr. Cosgrove’s statement, that to leave out the recognition of God would check immigration. He pointed to the Constitution of the United States, which contains no recognition of God, and said that there was no trouble about immigration to this

country.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.3*

One speaker said: "If I remember right, the Bible says 'there is a time and place for everything.' It also says, 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.' The convention therefore should not place the name anywhere, simply to tickle the ear of any individual or set of individuals." This, again, touches the very heart of the matter. We have already shown that such a recognition as is proposed would be falsehood upon its face; and because of this, it would be a taking of the name of the Deity in vain. God's name is taken in vain every time it is spoken lightly, every time it is mentioned in any way by those who have not at heart real reverence for God.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.4*

Mr. Warner stated that he was a member of a church which had the most reverent devotion to God; but he did not believe it necessary to advertise that fact in their business transactions.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.5*

Mr. Sturdevant showed the folly of the proposed recognition, by saying:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.6*

"As well acknowledge the existence of the Supreme Being and an overruling Providence in the making of a promissory note, as in this constitution; yet who would not say it was ridiculous if you saw a promissory note something like this: 'For value received, I promise to pay to John Doe, or order, \$100.00, recognizing the overruling providence of the Supreme Court, and the credit business and the great privileges which have been conferred upon me by the Supreme Being by reason of this promissory note.' Then again: What would be said in court of the lawyer commencing his complaint in this way: 'John Doe vs. Richard Roe; the plaintiff in the above entitled action, recognizing the overruling power and constant care of the Supreme Being, complains of Richard Roe, and alleges,' etc. Now that is just as sensible, in my opinion, as placing it in the preamble of the constitution. Let us ask God to guide us and teach us common sense in the business which we are trying he transact in this convention."*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.7*

We have devoted this much space to the consideration of the

discussion in the Washington convention, because the principles involved are the same as those involved in the attempt to recognize God in the national Constitution. We are anxious in this whole National Reform business to get the people to see that opposition to it does not imply irreverence or infidelity on the part of the opposers, but that the one who has the most intelligent reverence for God, and love for truth and pure Christianity, is the one who will be most zealously opposed to the schemes of the National Reformers. E. J. W.*AMS November 20, 1889, page 338.8*

**“Why They Are Anxious” American Sentinel 4, 42.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Pearl of Days* which, as is well known, is the organ of the American Sabbath Union, and is devoted exclusively to the work of securing the enactment and enforcement of Sunday laws by the State and the national government, presents the following, which was said by an eminent Sunday advocate:—*AMS November 20, 1889, page 341.1*

“A gentleman living in the country, whose supply of water for household purposes was scant, had a cistern dug near his house for collecting the rain which fell on the roofs of the buildings. For a time the expedient answered perfectly; the supply of water was abundant. Suddenly, however, the pump failed to give forth the contents of the reservoir. The rain would fall copiously, and for a time a few pailfuls would be drawn, but very soon the supply ceased. The pump was carefully examined and found to be in perfect working order, and no flaw could anywhere be discovered. At length it occurred to the perplexed householder to examine the cistern itself; then the mystery was solved. It was found that in one corner the cement had cracked, and there was a gaping leak which allowed the water to escape into a distant pit. It was now plain that however freely the rain might fall the cistern would soon be empty again, as there was this ever-widening leak through which the water disappeared. Such a leak in our church life is the Sabbath profaned or neglected. The rains from above may fall abundantly, the church’s machinery may be diligently plied, but the law of the Sabbath largely forgotten will prove a leak serious enough to undo

and render nugatory the happy influences both of the showers of Heaven and the labors of man. It has been well said: 'The streams of religion run deep or shallow according as the banks of the Sabbath are kept up or neglected.'"AMS November 20, 1889, page 341.2

"This," says the *Pearl of Days*, "forcibly illustrates the cause of the love of church life." This may all be true, but to our mind it furnishes no argument for the enactment of a Sunday law. It is strange that people cannot see that the anxiety for Sunday laws is purely from a church standpoint. These people want Sunday laws, for what reason?—Because the church will be the gainer thereby, and because they expect that people will go to church more. Not only do they expect that people who now care nothing for the church will go to church when, other places of amusement are shut up, but they expect that people who are already church members; but who neglect their duties, will take hold of church work, if they are spurred up to it by the State. In other words, they want the State to legislate in behalf of the church, and to enforce church discipline.AMS November 20, 1889, page 341.3

It may seem to some that the expression just used concerning places of amusement is very irreverent. We do not mean to cast any reflection on the churches, but the point is this. It cannot be denied that the great desire for Sunday law is that people who now find "amusement on Sunday, may constrained to go to church; and those who are working for such laws confess that picnics, theaters, concerts, Sunday newspapers, etc., are greater attractions than the church; but they expect by prohibiting these attractions to induct the people to come to church. That is, people want to pass the time in some way, and if they cannot do it with their favorite amusement they will then take the next thing that presents itself, and will go to church. In other words, they will go to church for a pastime the same as they now attend concerts, etc. They will simply substitute a form of amusement which is allowed in place of one which they would prefer, but which is prohibited. The movement may result in filling the churches, but it will not result in the spiritual and moral advancement of the people.AMS November 20, 1889, page 341.4

E. J. W.

## November 27, 1889

**“National Reform Success Means Religious Persecution” American Sentinel 4, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is most strenuously denied by all National Reformers, just as we should naturally expect; because if they should claim, or even admit, that the success of their movement would involve persecution, they could not proceed a step farther. As a matter of course, we expect that they will deny that persecution will follow the success of their movement. Doubtless a great majority of them are sincere in this denial, because they have never taken the trouble to look to the end of their work; and of all people in the world National Reformers seem to be most oblivious to the teachings of history; but their denials amount to nothing in the face of the declarations that they have made from the beginning, and are still making. We will quote a few statements.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.1*

Before the first annual meeting of the association an address to the public in behalf of the cause was prepared by the Rev. T. P. Stevenson, W. W. Spear, D.D., and Wm. Getty, Esq., in which the following statement was made:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.2*

“It must be deplored that in a Constitution so universally and so justly admired and loved and studied by the American people, there is nothing to turn the mind of the nation to God, to inculcate reverence for the authority of his Sons, or respect for his word.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.3*

This shows plainly that the design of the National Reformers is to so modify the Constitution that the government will act as a teacher of religion. In the address of Dr. Johnathan Edwards, at the New York convention, in 1873, it was said of the Constitution:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.4*

“We want to put the people into it; the people in full, with their deep and noble reverence for God, the greatest and best, and for his-



word as the underlying and paramount law.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.5*

Again: In the Cincinnati convention, in 1872, Rev. A. D. Mayo, D.D., in an address on religion in public schools, said that “the State should teach the existence, sovereignty, and providence of God, and the duty of all men and nations to obey his laws; the spiritual nature, moral obligation, natural rights, and immortal life of man; the binding obligation of the morality of Jesus Christ as the only universal moral law; the acceptance of the New Testament morality as the moral constitution of every civilized State.” He further said that the State is bound to see that the religious morality essential to good citizen-ship is taught.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.6*

At a convention hold in Monmouth, Ill., September 29, 1884, Rev. M. A. Gault said:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.7*

“This movement includes the triumph of every moral reform. Every true reform is simply an effort to get back to some one of the ten commandments. If that law was recognized as the standard of legislation, and if public sentiment was educated up to that standard, it would do away with lying, stealing, intemperance, profanity, Sabbath. desecration, licentiousness, murder, and every evil that now vexes society.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.8*

These statements show that the reform contemplates simply the adoption of the Bible as the law of the land. This was plainly declared by Dr. Edwards in the New York Convention. He said:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.9*

“If there be anything in the law of Moses the coming of Christ and the subsequent of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be (and there cannot be many of them), and we are prepared to accept them, and have them re-enacted.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.10*

We say that with such a Constitution as this, persecution would be inevitable; but as facts are better than arguments, we will give an instance illustrative of the working of such a Constitution in the past.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.11*

The New York *Observer* of March 22, 1888, contained the fifth of a

series of articles on John Calvin, written by the Rev. James M. Lucile D.D. The articles were, as a matter of course eulogistic of Calvin. The article in the issue referred to was upon the trial of Servetus, and the last days of Calvin. Having mentioned the visit of Servetus to Geneva, and his arrest mid trial, the Doctor says:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.12*

“The specific charge against Servetus was that of teaching contrary to the Bible doctrines; but this was only a specification under the more general charge of attempting to destroy the peace, and, indeed, the existence, of the Genevan State. The Genevans had adopted the Bible as a part of their constitution, and every citizen had sworn to defend it; Servetus was thus the foe to the civil order. It was in no sense an ecclesiastical trial, but one which belonged to the civil court, by which it was conducted. Calvin was an expert witness on the points raised, not a judge. That the animus was not that of religious rancor is evident from the fact that Calvin himself was at the same time in fraternal correspondence with acknowledged heretics, like Socinus. But when the heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the republic, it became a different matter, and the Genevans would have been unworthy of their political existence if they had not been willing to defend it.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.13*

The Genevans had a model National Reform government; and the burning of Servetus was a natural result, just as Dr. Ludlow says. And the fact that a man can be found who will apologize for the burning of Servetus, and who will say that it was not an ecclesiastical trial, still at the same time admitting that it was the result of the Bible being adopted as a part of the constitution, is sufficient evidence that if the National Reformers should succeed in having the Bible adopted as part of the Constitution, doctors of divinity and influential teachers would not be lacking who would defend persecution under it.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.14*

But note that it is denied that the burning of Servetus was persecution, or that his trial was an ecclesiastical trial. It is stated that his heresy was made a lever for the overthrow of the government. But how could a heresy affect the government?—Simply because the Bible had been adopted as a part of the

constitution-not necessarily the Bible as it reads, but the Bible as interpreted by those in authority; and, therefore, whoever differed in opinion from the established belief concerning the Bible, was talking treason and violating the civil law. If it be denied that the execution of the law in such cases is persecution, then there never was persecution; for when the early martyrs were put to death it was only because they were violating the laws of Rome. James and Paul were beheaded simply because their conscientious convictions in regard to the Bible compelled them to violate the civil law of Rome. And so with what we have been accustomed to call the Roman Catholic persecution in the Dark Ages. If the trial of Servetus was not an ecclesiastical trial, and his execution was not religious persecution, simply because in differing with Calvin concerning the Scriptures he was going contrary to the law of the State, then the Catholics never persecuted anybody; for Cranmer, and Ridley, and Huss, and Jerome of Prague, and thousands of others who were burned at the stake, were tried and put to death for disobeying civil laws. The laws of the church were the laws of the State. The one who defends the burning of Servetus must likewise defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, and the destruction of the Huguenots and Albigenses. All these people were put to death simply because the Bible, as interpreted by the priests, was a part of the civil law of those countries. The Catholic Church says that all these persons were punished by the State as law breakers. This is in one sense true; but they neglect to state that the church apprehended them, and priests tried them. The Inquisition found them guilty of violating the ecclesiastico-civil law, and they handed them over to the State for punishment, recommending them always to mercy, but expressly stipulating that they should be burned at the stake; and the civil power, as the servant of the church, was bound to obey.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 345.15*

Let the State become the servant of the church again, according to National Reform ideas, and let anybody's interpretation of the Bible, we care not whose, become a part of the civil law, and the same thing will take place again. It cannot be otherwise, for the State is bound to enforce whatever laws it enacts. If it enacts laws concerning matters of faith and doctrine, then it is bound to punish the man who differs from the established faith. But such punishment is simply religious persecution.*AMS November 27, 1889, page*

The cool way in which Dr: Ludlow disposes of Servetus, finds a parallel in the way that men defend the enforcement of Sunday as at the present time. Says he:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.2*

“If there was one place in the world the fugitive should have avoided, it was Geneva. The laws of that place he knew were very strict. Calvin had long before warned him not to come there to disturb the peace. The people of that commonwealth had the right to protect their political existence. They had fought for twenty years to get rid of Catholic tyranny, and were now in a life-and-death struggle with the Libertine element. Yet Servetus turned up in Geneva. His purpose was clear. Here the Romish Inquisition could not follow him, for the Calvinists would defend him against that. But while thus receiving their hospitality, he could get a dagger under the fifth rib of Calvinism by siding with the Libertines.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.3*

We say this is simply abominable. The man that could coolly write such a paragraph as that would be a worthy companion of Loyola, and a ready tool of the Inquisition. He says that Calvin had warned Servetus and to come to Geneva to disturb the peace, and that the people had a right to protect their political existence. But what was their politics?—It was Calvinism. Servetus disturbing the peace did not consist in beating drums, or doing noisy work during public service, or in making any demonstrations whatever, but in writing and talking against Calvinism, as Dr. Ludlow himself says. The sum of his offense was opposition to Calvinism. For this and this alone he was burned. And a professed Protestant in this century and in this decade, upholds the cowardly and blood-thirsty deed! Yet there are men found who say that this is too enlightened an age to allow such a thing as persecution for religious opinion.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.4*

Such talk is very similar to that indulged in by the advocates of National Reform Sunday laws. They want to protect the peace of society, they say. It was only two weeks ago that a friend of ours was talking with another gentleman concerning the barbarous

Sunday law of Georgia and the conviction of Mr. Conklin for cutting saplings in the woods on his farm on Sunday. Instead of expressing the contempt and indignation which every right-minded man must feel at so outrageous a law as that of Georgia, and at the persecution of an inoffensive citizen, the gentleman seemed to take his conviction as a matter of course, and threw the blame all on Mr. Conklin, saying he knew what the law was before he went to work; he need not have suffered if he had been of a mind to avoid it. If he had not known the law, there might be some ground of pity; but when he knew the law and deliberately violated it, nobody but himself is to blame for the result.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.5*

But when the National Reform American Sabbath Union movement succeeds, it will not be necessary for the person to work in order to disturb the peace. Servetus disturbed the peace of Geneva by writing and talking against Calvinism, because Calvinism was the politics of Geneva. And so when the State “re-enacts the fourth commandment,” as Mr. Shepard and Mr. Crafts say, Sunday will be a State institution, and the individual who talks against that institution by declaring that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh and not the first day, will be a disturber of the public peace. As much as this is contemplated in the statement which we have before quoted from the Western Christian Advocate, edited by Rev. G. W. Bothwell, D.D., of Oakland, Cal. Speaking of the petition against a Sunday law and the union of Church and State, in his issue of March 22, Mr. Bothwell said: —*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.6*

“Most of the States make provision for the exercise of the peculiar tenets of belief which are entertained by the Adventists. They can worship on Saturday, and call it the Sabbath if they choose; but there let their privileges end. Instead of thankfully making use of concessions granted them, and then going off quietly and attending to their own business as they ought, they start out making unholy alliances that they may defeat the purposes of their benefactors. None of these bills are aimed at them; but if they fail to appreciate the fact, they may yet call down upon themselves such a measure of public disfavor as that legislation embarrassing to them will result.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.7*

This is simply a threat of punishment that will be meted out to those who shall dare to protest against national religious legislation, and shall dare to teach that Sunday is not the Sabbath. It will not be necessary for them to work on Sunday; if by their preaching according to their conscientious convictions concerning the word, they strike against the established religion, they will be considered as violators of the public peace, and will meet with punishment.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.8*

Finally, as demonstrating conclusively, even to those who cannot draw conclusions, we quote the following bold declaration from a speech by Dr. Mayo in the Cincinnati National Reform Convention. Speaking of the people of the United States, he said:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.9*

“They will plant in the great charter of liberties an acknowledgment of the nation’s dependence on Almighty God, and its duty to conform to the laws of religious and Christian morality. They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion drives him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen. And that will is always open to revision by constitutional means.”*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.10*

We do not know how anyone can ask for any stronger proof than this that the National Reform movement contemplates persecution. And note, it is not even claimed that the persecution will be for actual violation of the law of God, but for acting or thinking contrary to the will of the majority concerning moral duties, with the express understanding that that will may change at any time.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.11*

Any person who can defend so outrageous a scheme has no sense whatever of what constitutes liberty. If any National Reformer can explain these utterances so as to make them harmonize with the golden rule, and with simple justice, the columns of the SENTINEL are open to him.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.12*

E. J. W.

**“They Are One” American Sentinel 4, 44.**

E. J. Waggoner

The *Christian Statesman*, of September 5, contains a report of the Lakeside Reform Assembly, by the editor, T. P. Stevenson. This assembly was a joint convention of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the National Reform Association. The first three days were devoted to the Woman's Christian Temperance Union work, in which addresses were given upon "Woman Suffrage" and "Sabbath Observance." Addresses were delivered on "The Limits of Religious Liberty," and "The American Sabbath, and How to Maintain It." After noting the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference, Mr. Stevenson introduces the work of the days devoted especially to the National Reform Association, with these words:—*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.13*

"There was no perceptible transition between the foregoing exercises and those properly relating to the National Reform Association." *AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.14*

This strikes us as very significant. It shows how rapidly the great Woman's Christian Temperance Union is losing sight of the object for which it was established, and is becoming simply a National Reform organization. The meetings of one cannot be distinguished from those of the other. *AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.15*

From Mr. Stevenson's report, we would not get the idea that the subject of temperance was mentioned in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union Conference. Of course we are not to suppose that the subject of temperance was entirely ignored, but the report warrants us in believing that temperance remitted less attention than woman's suffrage and Sunday legislation. We are sorry that this is so. We, are sorry that in combating religious legislation, which is evil, and only evil, we are placed in antagonism to the work of a professedly temperance organization. We believe in temperance of the strictest kind, and wish to support every temperance measure and every temperance' organization; therefore we hope that the women of the National W.C.T.U. who believe that it should be devoted exclusively to temperance work and there are very many of them-will be able either to convert the national association, or else to fore a branch which will work in a

legitimate way for real Christian temperance, and which we can support.*AMS November 27, 1889, page 346.16*

E. J. W.



## December 4, 1889

“‘Legitimate Recreation’” *American Sentinel* 4, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

In the report of the thirty and thirty-first years of the New York Sabbath Committee, we find a section on the Saturday half-holiday movement, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:—*AMS December 4, 1889, page 353.1*

“The Saturday half-holiday movement, from which much was hoped in its indirect influence upon the Sunday observance, has not accomplished as yet what was expected from it. Said Governor Hill, in a speech at Dunkirk, with reference to this measure: ‘There may be a legal difficulty in dividing a day, making only one-half of it a legal holiday. That difficulty can be avoided by making every Saturday-the whole day-a holiday. Saturday would thus be set apart as a day of recreation and pleasure, and the following Sunday would become, what it was intended to be, emphatically a day of rest, and a better observance of Sunday would be promoted. Sunday is rapidly becoming a day of recreation, especially in the summer season, instead of a day of rest. Such a holiday would afford every workingman an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take.’”*AMS December 4, 1889, page 353.2*

There are two points suggested by this which are worthy of serious thought. The first is in connection with the claim that the Sunday law is a temperance measure in that it will close the saloons on Sunday. It is well known that when the charge of discrimination is made of tacitly making the liquor traffic legitimate on other days by excluding the sale of intoxicants on Sunday, the Sunday-law people say that it is necessary because people are idle on Sunday, and, therefore, are then more subject to the attractions of the saloon; that if the saloons are closed on Sunday, when people are idle, the bulk of their traffic will be taken away.*AMS December 4, 1889, page 353.3*

The fallacy of this claim was shown in the *SENTINEL* a few weeks

ago by a quotation from the *Voice*; but the effort of the Sunday-law movers to have Saturday made a half or a whole holiday is the strongest demonstration of the hollowness of their temperance professions. While professing to want the saloons closed on Sunday in order simply to protect the idle laboring men, they at the same time, work to have the pre-ceding day made a holiday, in which the workingmen shall be idle. But we have never heard of a Saturday-closing movement, so that it would seem that the saloon is dangerous to idle men only on Sunday.*AMS December 4, 1889, page 353.4*

But what is specially interesting in the paragraph we have quoted is the closing sentence in the extract from Governor Hill's speech. After recommending the setting apart of Saturday as a day of recreation and pleasure, so that Sunday might become emphatically a day of rest, he says: "Such a holiday would afford every man an opportunity for pleasure, for some travel, for visiting friends, for study, and for whatever other legitimate recreation he may desire to take!" That is the object of the proposed Saturday half-holiday; it is to allow the workingman time to take the recreation which he needs, but which would be prohibited by such a Sunday law as is desired. And what is the recreation? Read the above sentence again. It is travel, visiting friends, and study. Nothing could more plainly indicate that the proposed law would prohibit such quiet recreation as visiting friends and studying. Surely this would be the Puritan law with a vengeance. It would involve the spying into houses by the minions of the law, to see who is reading the newspaper or studying, or to see who is receiving an innocent visit from a friend. It is a striking comment on the inevitable working of a Sunday law, that its friends cannot make even the most incidental allusion to it without revealing the cloven foot of the Inquisition.*AMS December 4, 1889, page 353.5*

E. J. W.

## December 25, 1889

**“Civil Government and the Decalogue” American Sentinel 4, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

The advocates of Sunday legislation are earnestly trying to find a basis for their proposed action, in the fourth commandment. It is true that that commandment says nothing about the first day, which is the only day that National Reformers would consent to have the State set apart, while it does specifically enjoin the observance of the seventh day; and it is also true that if they could find in the fourth commandment some authority for Sunday observance, that would show beyond the possibility of cavil that their movement is simply an effort to secure religious legislation; but none of these things move them. They have, however, through the kind offices of the AMERICAN SENTINEL been brought to see that civil governments have to do only with civil matters; and, therefore, in order to have a show of reason for their work, they are claiming that there are civil elements in the ten commandments, inasmuch as some of those precepts relate to man's duty to his fellow-men. *AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.1*

There has been in the past a great deal of unnecessary discussion over the two tables of the decalogue. It has been rightfully claimed that with the first table of the law civil governments have nothing to do; and the National Reformers themselves more than half believe this. Mr. Crafts, who stands for the American Sabbath Union, has spent a great deal of time of late trying to readjust the tables of the law, so as to make the action of his association consistent with the principle just stated. Instead of dividing the decalogue into two tables, the first containing four commandments, and the second the last six, which is the most common division, he makes the division just after the first clause of the fourth commandment, putting the bulk of the fourth, and the last six, into the second table. Of course this is entirely arbitrary, having no authority but Mr. Crafts' assertion; but it serves to show that Mr. Crafts appreciates the truth of the statement that civil governments have of right nothing to do with the first table of the decalogue. *AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.2*

But that statement tells only a part of the truth, and is misleading; for the fact is that civil governments have nothing whatever to do with any of the ten commandments, whether in the first table or in the second. The discussion as to the two tables of the law is entirely unnecessary, and will be seen to be so when the character of the whole law is understood. The proposition which we lay down is this: Civil laws are not based upon, and do not derive their force from, the divine law; and civil government has nothing whatever to do with any commandment of the decalogue. This we think can readily be made to appear.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.3*

1. The law is a unit. It is, as a whole, the expression of God's will, the transcript of his character; and therefore whatever is true of one part of the law is true of the whole.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.4*

2. The inspired declaration is that "the law is spiritual." *Romans 7:14*. This is spoken, not merely of the first four commandments, but of the whole law. Let us dwell upon this point for a few moments.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.5*

While it is true that the first four commandments pertain to our duties to God exclusively, and the last six relate to duties that also affect our fellows, it is not true that there is any less morality or spirituality in the last six than in the first four. Although they define human duties, there is in them no human element. They are spiritual, and obedience to them must be spiritual. Anything else is not obedience.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.6*

Take for illustration our Saviour's comments on certain commandments, recorded in *Matthew 5:20-28*. In that passage we find that a word may be sufficient to constitute a violation of the sixth commandment, and that the seventh may be broken by a single look, or even a thought. It is worthy of note that the commandments whose breadth the Saviour thus indicated, are found in the second table. Now what did he do?—He simply showed what those commandments require. From his words we learn that the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," forbids malicious thoughts and words. He who indulges in these does not keep the commandment at all, although he may never have laid violent

hands on any man. The commandment which says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," forbids impure desires. It does not stop short of that. He who indulges in these violates the seventh commandment, although he may have lived a hermit all his life.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.7*

From the words of the apostle Paul, and the illustrative application of Jesus, we learn that the law-including every commandment-is wholly spiritual. If it is not kept spiritually, it is not kept at all. There is no such thing as degrees in the commandments, so that a man may keep them half way, and receive credit therefor, as seems to be supposed by, those who talk about keeping the law outwardly. It is true that as the greater includes the less, strict compliance with the letter of the law is demanded, and is necessarily included in spiritual obedience; but the man whose apparent conformity to the law is only outward, has not yielded any obedience to it whatever. The law is wholly spiritual, wholly divine.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.8*

3. But civil government is not spiritual. No one can gainsay this proposition. Inasmuch as civil government cannot enforce spirituality, and cannot make men spiritually-minded, it has no right nor power to require spirituality. "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." A spiritual ruler justly requires spiritual obedience. He can punish for violation of a spiritual law. But a civil ruler cannot execute spiritual law. Therefore the proposition is proved, that civil government has nothing whatever to do with spiritual law, and such a law is the decalogue. This proposition becomes self-evident as soon as one views the law of God in the light in which he himself sets it forth.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 377.9*

We can say, then, without the slightest fear of successful contradiction, that human laws are not based upon; and do not derive their force from, the divine law. The State rightfully makes laws against the taking of human life, but not in any sense as an enforcement of the divine commandment, or of any part of it. Does anybody suppose that a murderer who is legally hanged for his crime, will receive less punishment in the great Judgment-day than if he had escaped the civil penalty?—Of course not. Man punished

him for his inhumanity; God punishes for immorality; and the sixth commandment is not human, but divine.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.1*

The great cause for confusion lies in a wrong use of terms. Like the hypocritical Pharisees of old, men have come to confound morality and respectability. A man who does nothing to shock the sensibilities of his neighbors, and who does not interfere with their rights, is called a moral man, when in fact he may be grossly immoral. He is a good citizen, but if he is not pure at heart he is not a keeper of the divine law in any sense whatever. That law is spiritual, and that which is not spiritual is not to the slightest degree obedience to it.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.2*

If National Reformers and national Sunday-law advocates had any just conception of the nature of divine law, they would cease their insane attempt to make-men moral by law, or to enforce the law of God. But because they have no real knowledge of divine government, and fancy themselves competent to act as its high executive officers, they also lose sight of the prime object of civil government, and ruthlessly trample upon human right.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.3*

E. J. W.

**“Why We Oppose Religious Legislation” American Sentinel 4, 48.**

E. J. Waggoner

This is a subject that should be clearly defined in the mind of every individual, especially of those who act as teachers either in public or private, or who have the power to influence public opinion to any degree whatever. Those who favor religious legislation very naturally imagine that opposition to their movement is actuated by selfish motives. They think that our only reason for opposing it is the fear that it will tend to inconvenience or endanger us. We say it is very natural that they, should imagine that opposition to their movement is wholly selfish, because religious legislation is actuated by nothing; but the most selfish motives; and those who advocate it cannot grasp the idea that there can be any action that is not

selfish. To anticipate direct argument, we might call attention to the fact that their suspicion of our motives gives evidence of their real ideas of the natural results of the success of their movement. If they did not know that their movement cannot fail to result in persecution, they would not think that our sole reason for opposing it is the danger of being persecuted. But this, we may say, scarcely enters into the account at all. Our reasons for opposing religious legislation are not personal, but general, and of such a nature that we think all candid persons can appreciate them when fairly presented.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.1*

The first reason that we present—not the strongest, yet in itself amply sufficient, and one that will appeal most strongly to the largest number of people—is that religious legislation tends directly to the overthrow of civil liberty; it is based on the principle that minorities have no rights that majorities are bound to respect. As the matter of religious legislation is a live issue at the present time, we will take for our proofs and illustrations items from the working of the movement in this country.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.2*

And first it will be necessary to show that religious legislation is sought for at the present time. This we can do by the statements of those who are working for a national Sunday law. In his plea before the Knights of Labor, for help in securing a Sunday law, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.3*

“A weekly day of rest has never been permanently secured in any land except on the basis of religious obligation. Take the religion out, and you take the rest out.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.4*

Rev. J. H. Knowles, editor of the *Pearl of Days*, said in an editorial of January 25, 1889:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.5*

“It will become more and more apparent that the real defenders of the day are among those who regard it a divine, not merely a human institution.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.6*

Col. Elliott F. Shepard, in accepting the presidency of the American Sabbath Union, said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.7*

“The work, therefore, of this society is only just begun. We do not put this work on mere human reasoning; for all that can be overthrown by human reason. We rest it directly and only on the divine commandment.”—*Pearl of Days, January 25, 1889.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.8

Article 3 of the constitution of the American Sabbath Union reads thus:—AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.9

“The object of this union is to preserve the Christian Sabbath as a day of rest and worship.”AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.10

And finally, the Blair Sunday-Rest bill, which was so heartily indorsed by this union and by the National Reform Association, expressly declared that it should be construed—AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.11

“To secure to the whole people rest from toil during the first day of the week, their mental and moral culture, and the religious observance of the Sabbath-day.”AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.12

This evidence might be multiplied, but it is sufficient to show that Sunday legislation is religious legislation, and nothing else. Now let us examine its nature and results.AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.13

In Prof. Herrick Johnson’s address before the American Sabbath Union, on the Sunday newspaper, an address which the union circulated broadcast over the country as an official document, there are four propositions laid down, the fourth one of which, taken from an Illinois Supreme Court report, is as follows:—AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.14

“Every individual has the right to the enjoyment of the Christian Sabbath without liability to annoyance from the ordinary secular pursuits of life, except so far as they may be dictated by necessity or charity.”AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.15

This proposition is a sound one. We have no fault to find with it in itself, but only with the way it is applied; for the Sunday-law



advocates' idea of giving people a *right* to rest on Sunday is to compel everybody to rest. The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of a rest on Sunday is no more self-evident than that every individual has the right not to rest on that day, but to rest on some other day. Both these propositions being true, it is very clearly seen that ample provision is already made against anybody being unnecessarily disturbed on his chosen day of rest. We concede that everybody who wishes to rest upon Sunday has the right, and should be protected in the right, to do so undisturbed. But the very essence of Sunday legislation, and the only foundation upon which it rests, is the theory that those who choose to rest on any other day than Sunday have no right to the enjoyment of that rest undisturbed, and have no right to refrain from resting on Sunday.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.16*

That this is what is implied by the proposition for our proofs laid down by Mr. Johnson, and indorsed by the American Sabbath Union, is clearly shown by their official statements. Thus Dr. Edwards, in to an address before the National Reform Convention held in New York in 1873, having stated that the National Reform movement is opposed to atheism in the government, gave his idea of atheism as follows. Said he:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.17*

“The atheist is the man who denies the being of a God and a future life. To him, mind and matter are the same, and time is the be-all and the end-all of consciousness and of character.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.18*

“The deist admits God, but denies that he has any such personal control over human affairs as we call providence, or that he ever manifests himself and his will in a revelation.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.19*

“The Jews admit God, providence, and revelation, but reject the entire scheme of gospel redemption by Jesus Christ, as sheer imagination, or, worse, sheer imposture.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.20*

“The Seventh-day Baptists believe in God and Christianity, and are conjoined with the other members of this class by the accident of

differing with the mass of Christians upon the question of what precise day of the week shall be observed as holy.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.21*

“These are all for the occasion, and so far as our amendment is concerned, one class.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.22*

Here we find that when the National Reform movement shall have succeeded, the individual who does not regard Sunday will be counted as an atheist. Now listen to what Dr. Edwards said of atheists, in the same address:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.23*

“What are the rights of the atheist? I would tolerate him as I would tolerate a poor lunatic, for in my view his mind is scarcely sound. So long as he does not rave, so long as he is not dangerous, I would tolerate him. I would tolerate him as I would a conspirator.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.24*

This is simply saying that under the National Reform *regime*, the man who should dare to observe another day than Sunday would be considered as having no rights whatever, and entitled to no respect. If he should dare to publicly declare his belief, his insanity would be considered dangerous, and he would be shut up.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.25*

This has been stated even more plainly in an article in the *Christian Statesman*, July 7, 1887, entitled, “The Bible in the Public Schools,” which was editorially commended as “a masterly article.” The writer said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.26*

“Some advanced champions for freedom of conscience and the rights of men, in Britain and the United States, cannot be accommodated. In this category must be classed agnostics, atheists, and scientific infidels. For my part, without hesitation or apology, I deny such men any reasonable claim to conscientious convictions and privileges at all.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.27*

Now substitute in the above Mr. Edwards’ definition of an atheist, and you have the simple statement that under National Reform

government, people who do not observe Sunday-no matter how strictly they may observe another day of the week-will not be considered as having any claim to conscientious convictions and privileges-they will not be considered as having any rights whatever.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.28*

Now listen to another statement. It is from the *Christian Nation*, of September 15, 1886. This is one of the official organs of the National Reform Association, and therefore may be depended upon as properly representing National Reform. I read:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 378.29*

“Neither does National Reform propose to deprive any citizens, without forfeiture, of any just and inalienable civil right.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.1*

But we have already shown from high authority that National Reformers consider that atheists-among whom are classed all who differ with them in religious faith, and especially those who differ with them in respect to the precise day of the week which should be observed-have no rights whatever; so that all a man will have to do to forfeit his rights in their estimation will be to disregard Sunday, or to religiously observe another day in its stead. Now mark, according to the statement that I have just read, National Reformers deliberately propose to deprive such citizens of just and inalienable rights.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.2*

And this is just what the advocates of religious legislation will do. The success of their movement cannot fail of resulting in religious persecution. With the above deliberately expressed intention to deprive men of just and inalienable rights, place another equally base avowal by Rev. Dr. A. D. Mayo, at the Cincinnati National Reform Convention, in 1872. After declaring that the people of the United States would acknowledge God in the Constitution, he said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.3*

“They will protect the rights of every citizen, and persecute no man for his religion until that religion leads him to disobey the law which expresses the will of the majority concerning the moral duty of the citizen.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.4*

Of course they will persecute. If they succeed in getting the laws that are desired, they cannot do otherwise. For the State is bound to enforce all the laws on its statute-books. If it has laws concerning religion and religious practices, it must enforce them, or else have its authority despised. But the punishment of a man because he differs with others in matters of religious faith and practice, is simply religious persecution.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.5*

Mr. Blair declared ("Senate Hearing," p. 97) that the only object of the proposed national Sunday law is to make efficient the existing Sunday laws of the States. Yet inefficient as he considers them, they have proved efficient enough in Georgia, Tennessee, and Arkansas to deprive men of property, of liberty, and, indirectly, even of life. Now listen to what Rev. J. M. Foster, district secretary of the National Reform Association, said when pressed to give his opinion of these outrages:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.6*

"As to the alleged cases of persecution in three States, I have read the description of the cases in Arkansas, and they are not of the public-spirited class that is willing to suffer for the common good. The old man and his son of seventeen, whose horse was sold for \$27, and the man whose young wife and child died while he was in prison, brought that evil on themselves by breaking the law."—*Christian Statesman, Oct. 10, 1889. AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.7*

It is not too much to say that such talk is fiendish. Let no man say that persecution will not follow the passage of religious laws. It cannot be otherwise. And it will not be the vicious and depraved who will be the most active in the persecution. No; it will be the very men who are considered the guardians of public morals. Men who are personally very pleasant and amiable may make the worst sort of persecutors; when they get so blind that they can regard as a common criminal the one who disregards an unjust human law in order that he may obey a just and divine commandment. One of the strongest indictments against religious legislation is that its tendency is to transform naturally amiable men into cold-blooded demons of cruelty.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.8*

Human rights are God-given; and since God is no respecter of

persons, it follows that he has given to all men the same rights; and thus the Declaration of Independence simply formulated a Heaven-born truth when it declared that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is, all men are created equal with respect to the rights with which they are endowed. Every man has a God-given right to find his pleasure, enjoy liberty, and pursue happiness in his own way. Of course it is understood that no one shall interfere with another; for all are to be equally protected; and if all are equally protected, none will be interfered with. Now it needs no argument to show that one man's violation of Sunday does not deprive another man of his privilege to rest. That ten men in any community who do not observe Sunday, do not in the slightest degree interfere with the right and liberty of the thousands of others to observe that day, is clearly shown by the fact that in scores of instances a single individual observes the seventh day regularly and strictly, and is not hampered in that observance in the least by the fact that thousands of others openly disregard it, and have no respect for his observance of it. *AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.9*

The proposition that every individual has the right to the enjoyment of Sunday, rightly interpreted, is only the inverse of the proposition that every individual has the right to the observance of Saturday, or of any other day, or, so far as man is concerned, of no day at all. But Sunday laws, as before stated, make no provision for the rights of any except those who observe Sunday, and deliberately propose to deprive all others of their God-given rights. As the *Christian Nation* says; they propose to deprive certain individuals of inalienable rights and privileges. Thus by their own mouth it is proved that religious legislation, as embodied in the movement of the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union, is a direct blow at the foundation of our government, and is directly in opposition to the Declaration of Independence,—the charter of American liberty. It is un-American, and that alone should be sufficient to condemn it. The man who in a public assembly would declare that the framers and signers of the Declaration of Independence were misguided men, and that their work was a fraud, would be set down as the worst kind of an anarchist. The preacher who should make such a statement would lose his

congregation. The teacher who would make such a declaration to a class would be expelled from the public schools. Yet the National Reform Association and the American Sabbath Union make the same declaration no less boldly, although not in express terms. They have boldly and openly railed against the statement of the Declaration of Independence that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.10*

We say, then, that their movement ought to be opposed, because it is of the very essence of anarchy. It does not help the matter to say that those whose rights are thus disregarded are only a few, although Sunday-law advocates think to console themselves with this idea. Thus Dr. Edwards said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.11*

“The parties whose conscience we are charged with troubling, taken altogether, are but few in number. This determines nothing as to who is right; but the fact remains, and it worthy of note, that, taken all together, they amount to but a small fraction of our citizenship.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.12*

Almost every lecturer in behalf of Sunday legislation lays great stress upon the assertion that the observers of the seventh day “amount to but about seven-tenths of one per cent of the entire population;” and that, therefore, they are too insignificant to be noticed or to have their rights and privileges taken into account.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.13*

But right here is a principle which they overlook: It is not whether a few individuals who observe the seventh day may be ignored on that account, but whether the government can afford to disregard the rights of people simply because they are in the minority. Let the government once start upon the line of doing injustice to even a single individual, and there is no telling where it will stop. If a law may be enacted which will trample upon the rights of one individual, the same principle will allow the enactment of a law that will ignore the rights of many. If a few people may have their rights ignored because they differ with the majority as to the precise day of the week to be observed religiously, a few other people may have their

rights ignored because they differ with the majority on some other subject. Moreover, majorities and minorities are subject to fluctuation. Politics are changeable, and the side which has the majority to-day may, within a year, be represented only by a feeble minority; so that if the government once starts upon a career of injustice, not a single individual will have any guarantee of safety.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.14*

We have been proceeding upon the supposition that those who observe Sunday, and those who are working for national Sunday laws, are in the majority; but this is a great mistake. The population of the United States is between 60,000,000 and 70,000,000; of this number the best statistics-those which are furnished by the religious denominations themselves-show that, less than 15,000,000 are even professors of religion. Only that number of people have their names on church-books. According to the admission of leading men in this Sunday-law movement, a large per cent. of this number pay no more regard to Sunday than do non-professors. Therefore, it is self-evident that the attempt to secure Sunday laws, and to have the government enforce them, is an attempt by a very small minority to control the country.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.15*

The petition that has been presented to Congress had, according to the highest estimate-of its friends, only 14,000,000 indorsers; and of this number the larger portion never saw the petition. The Methodist Episcopal Church, the Baptist Church, the Presbyterian Church North and South; and the Reformed Church, are counted as having indorsed the petition; and yet it was only a few delegates from these bodies that indorsed it; and on the strength of this so-called indorsement, the entire membership was counted, to make 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000. Leave out the vast number who had never seen the petition, and that 6,000,000 would dwindle down to a small fraction of 1,000,000. Then, notwithstanding the fact that the Presbyterian Church was counted with the other denominations-which together only made up 6,000,000 of the 14,000,000-that church appears the second time in the same list of 14,000,000, thus furnishing 700,000 more to the list, all of which should be omitted.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.16*

Then, again, a letter from Cardinal Gibbons personally indorsing the

movement, was counted as adding 7,000,000 to the list, all of which should be deducted.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 379.17*

Then the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 200,000 strong, was added, to help swell the 14,000,000 list. But the very name of the association shows that all of its members are also members of the various Christian churches; and, therefore, they were counted in the denominations that are represented by wholesale.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.1*

Then, again, the Knights of Labor were counted over 200,000 strong, to help swell the list. But, in the first place, many of these are members of churches, and so had already appeared in the count of those churches; in the second place, of the 219,000 Knights, probably not more than 200 were present in the assembly which passed a vote favoring the petition. And, lastly, the fraud that was perpetrated in counting the entire body of the Knights of Labor as favoring the Sunday-law petition, is shown by a recent dispatch from Milwaukee to the *Chicago Tribune*. It stated that the Sunday-closing question was likely to cause a great deal of trouble to politicians in Wisconsin. It mentioned the effort that was being made by some of the churches to secure Sunday legislation, and closed thus:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.2*

“The proposition to hold a State mass convention for the purpose of organizing all over the State, has met with a great deal of favor, and will probably be put in effect sometime during the winter: The workers are also trying to interest the Knights of Labor in the movement.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.3*

This would sound very strange in the face of the fact that it has been certified to Congress that the Knights of Labor, 219,000 strong; have already indorsed the movement, did we not already know that that representation was a base fraud.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.4*

By this brief analysis of the pretended 14,000,000 signature petition, we have shown that an exceedingly small per cent. of the population of the United States is working for Sunday laws; but there is another point which will very largely cut; down even this small minority. The petition certifies that each one of its indorsers is



an adult resident of the United States, twenty-one years of age, or more; yet the entire membership of all the churches was counted, although it is well known that every large denomination has a large percentage of members who are less than twenty-one years of age. That this fraudulent representation was deliberately planned is shown by the confession of the leading worker, the field secretary of the American Sabbath Union. In attempting to defend himself and his co-workers from the charge of deliberate fraud in the matter, he made the following statement under oath:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.5*

“It is implied that some fraud was perpetrated because the whole membership of churches petitioning was given, not those above twenty-one only; but the records quoted show that there was no attempt to deceive. It is impossible to tell how many in a denomination are under twenty-one, and so the whole number is given.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.6*

Who cares how many in a denomination are under twenty-one years of age? What has that to do with the securing of a Sunday law? The petition has nothing to do with the number in any denomination who are under twenty-one years of age, or who are over twenty-one years of age. All it has to do is with the individuals who voluntarily sign it. If those who formed and circulated the petition had been honest in their intention, the question of how many in any denomination were or were not under twenty-one years of age, would not have troubled them at all.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.7*

But they were determined to swell their list of petitioners by every means possible. They could have *guessed* the number of church members who were above twenty-one years of age, and put that number down, and thus have presented a little more nearly the appearance of honest dealing; but they resolved to run no risk of making a mistake in number, and so put down the whole number, thus deliberately perpetrating a base fraud. It may well be said that no attempt was made to deceive, because the fraud is so transparent that no one in his senses could be deceived; but the imposition was none the less on that account.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.8*

If anyone asks what this has to do with the reasons why we oppose religious legislation, we reply that it has a great deal to do with it. Truth is never advanced by fraud; it cannot be. Truth never seeks to gain its ends by trickery, for that would defeat them. Truth has a natural and irreconcilable repugnance for error and falsehood, but wickedness can be fostered only by deceit. Therefore when any movement seeks to advance itself by any fraudulent means, there can be no better evidence that it is a wicked affair. In every age, from the time of Constantine until now, religious legislation by civil power has been built up by fraud, vindictive selfishness, and perjury.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.9*

From what has already been given, therefore, it is plainly evident that the movement in this country for a national Sunday law is a movement for religious legislation, and that this movement is a most wickedly selfish attempt on the part of a few people to get, control of the government; a deliberate design to overturn the just and inalienable rights of the majority who either conscientiously differ with them, or else are indifferent; and a settled determination to persecute even to death those who do not tamely yield to their usurpation of authority. It is the worst phase of anarchy that has ever appeared in this country, and should be opposed by every true American citizen.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.10*

Another, and the chief reason why we oppose religious legislation, is that, no matter how sincere and conscientious its advocates may be, its influence can be only to bar the progress of true religion, and to propagate immorality. The proof of this is ample. We will begin with the argument for the suppression of Sunday newspapers. The *National Presbyterian*, of January, 1889, in an editorial on "The Church and the Sunday Newspaper," said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.11*

"The responsibility of the church for the continued existence of the Sunday newspaper is beginning to attract the attention of thoughtful men. It is a fact which it is idle to attempt to conceal, that it is sustained by the patronage of the members of the evangelical churches. It is the support given them by this class, and this alone, that makes it practicable to continue the publication of these papers. The responsibility, then, of this great and growing evil is

with the church.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.12*

The Chicago *Advance* of January 24, 1889, contained an article by Rev. Geo. C. Noyes, D.D., entitled, “The Sunday Newspaper,—an Expostulation,” in which it was stated:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.13*

“If all the Christian people in the land who read or advertise in the Sunday papers were to withdraw their patronage, the publication of every one of them would cease within a month. Upon Christian people rests the responsibility of their continued publication.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.14*

The Rev. Herrick Johnson, in his published speech upon the Sunday newspaper, brings this indictment against it:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.15*

“It is tempting hundreds and thousands to stay away from the sanctuary, and making it manifold harder for the truth to reach those who go. Ruskin says, in view of the thronging activities of our times, the rush and roar of our busy life, the push and press and ambitions of trade, a minister on Sunday morning has just ‘thirty minutes to raise the dead in.’ The Sunday newspaper is another large stone laid on that sepulcher, making it just so much harder to raise the dead.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.16*

Again he says:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.17*

“This is the fearful indictment against it, that it is keeping an army of workmen from the day of rest they ought to have. It is educating an army of newsboys to trample on the Sabbath, and so counteracting the best influences that Christian people are making to throw around them.... It is honeycombing society with false notions about the Sabbath; and it is deadening the spiritual sensibilities even of many of the people of God.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.18*

Now, here is an acknowledged evil in the church; professed Christian people are having their spiritual sensibilities deadened, and are openly violating their church obligations; and what is the remedy proposed? Is it a revival of religion? or increased zeal on the part of the ministry? Oh; no; it is to have the State suppress the

thing which is leading them astray. What is the plan proposed to enable the minister to reach the people? Is it to ask the aid of the Holy Spirit?—Not at all; it is only to ask the aid of the State to suppress the Sunday newspaper. Thus the effect of religious legislation is to substitute the power of the State for the power of the Spirit of God. It surely can need no argument to show that the religion thus fostered will be only a hollow shell. It will be State religion, and not the religion of the Spirit of God.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.19*

The State may force people to church, and may enforce a form of religion, but the Spirit of God alone can reach the heart; and without this power an enforced form is worse than useless, since many people will trust in that form, and will rest content with that alone. It is a most humiliating confession of weakness and wickedness, when the church asks the aid of the State. Take the statements cited from the *National Presbyterian* and the *Advance*. Appeals for Sunday laws, based on such statements, amount to just this: "We have so much evil in the church—so many disorderly members—that we are unable to do anything; there are not enough conscientious members to discipline the disorderly ones, and not enough of the Spirit of God in the church to convert them; and so we must have the help of the State to enforce church discipline, and establish a form of godliness."*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.20*

They do not realize that this is simply to reject God and to trust in the power of man. Says Bishop Vincent, "The church makes a great mistake when it seeks to secure worldly position; and to influence temporal power." "The abomination of abominations is the aspiration after temporal power on the part of the church. All the church wants is spiritual power, and this goes out when temporal power is invoked."*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.21*

Those who appeal to the State to help the church in its struggles, should learn a lesson from Ezra. When he was on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem to build the city, he had to pass with women and children through a hostile country. He was greatly troubled; but instead of asking the king for a troop of soldiers to protect his company, he fasted and prayed to the Lord. Says he:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.22*

“For I was ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy in the way: because we had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him. So we fasted and besought our God for this: and he was entreated of us.” *Ezra 8:22, 23.AMS December 25, 1889, page 380.23*

The church has preached to the world about the power of God; yet, unlike Ezra, it is not ashamed to ask the world for help, instead of trusting in God. Thus they confess their lack of knowledge of God. Two great evils must result from this course: First, the world will no more believe that there is any such thing as the power of the Holy Spirit, and it will think itself supreme. Second, both the church and the world will be plunged more deeply into sin; because the church is appealing for help against an evil, to the very source of that evil. The world cannot purify the world. A worldly church cannot clear itself of worldliness by the aid of the world. Therefore Christians should oppose religious legislation for the honor of God, and for the preservation of his truth.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.1*

But I have a still stronger indictment in this line to bring against religious legislation. It is that such legislation naturally tends to the grossest immorality, and, what is worse, leads the vicious to think that they are Christians. Ground for this charge is found in the following statements. Dr. Edwards, in his New York address before referred to, said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.2*

“And yet another objection is that the laws of Moses will have to be re-enacted and enforced among us, and that these laws are not at all fitted to our times, our freedom, our civilization. I confess that I am not at all afraid of Moses.... Now, if there be anything in the laws of Moses which the coming of Christ and the subsequent overthrow of Judaism did not abrogate, let them be pointed out-there cannot be many of them-and we are prepared to accept there and have them re-enacted.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.3*

Again, in the hearing on the Sunday-Rest bill before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Blair asked the question:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.4*

“Suppose that human beings trying to live in accordance with the will of God, re-enact his law, and write it in their statute-books; is it wrong for society to put into its public laws the requirements of the obedience to God and his law?”—*Hearing, p, 65.AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.5*

And when this question had been answered by the statement that the effect of Sunday legislation is to call the attention of the individual to human authority, to the exclusion of the divine, Mr. Blair replied:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.6*

“The will of God exists. He requires the observance of the seventh day, just as he prohibits murder; and as we re-enact his law in making a law and re-enforcing it against murder, so all the States have en-acted laws against the desecration of the Sabbath, going further or not so far, according to the idea of various Legislatures.”—*lb. p. 66.AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.7*

Just think of it! Re-enacting the law of God! And not simply re-enacting it, but even going farther than God, according to the State Legislature! Was greater presumption ever dreamed of? What could more perfectly meet the description of the power that should oppose and exalt itself above all that is called God or that is worshiped?*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.8*

But listen to two more statements on the same point. In the *Christian Statesman* of May 30, 1889, Mr. Crafts said:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.9*

“Now the question comes right to this point: God having ordained the Sabbath, as you concede, with all religious organizations, here is the national government, which alone can make that law of God operative in this sphere of national action. Why should not the national government, then, re-enact that conceded law of the Almighty, and make it effective?”—*Hearing, p. 66.AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.10*

Here we see an utter ignoring of the power of the Spirit of God to influence men. The national government alone able to make the law of God effective!! We have already noted the blasphemous presumption of such an idea, but now after one more citation we

wish to call special attention to the result upon the people. In the *Christian Nation* of December 5, 1888, the Rev. N. M., Johnston, speaking of Christ's work on earth, said of him:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.11*

“He healed disease; an intimation that when his gospel shall prevail, and wickedness be suppressed by law, then pestilence and disease shall be unknown.”*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.12*

Now note the following points:—*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.13*

1. The law of God is spiritual. God requires truth in the inward parts. He has declared that outward compliance with his requirements amounts to nothing unless the service is from the heart. His word declares that hatred is murder, and that a lustful desire or look is adultery. No sign may be made that man can see, but God, who looks upon the heart, sees violation of his commandments. The Pharisees, who appeared righteous outwardly unto men, but were corrupt within, were denounced in most unmeasured terms. See *Matthew 23:26-28*.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.14*

2. As wickedness has to do with the heart, so has morality; and nothing but the Spirit of God can reach the heart. No law, not excepting the law of God, can put down wickedness. The only righteousness that is worthy of the name is the righteousness of faith. The apostle Paul declared that he did not want to be found at the last day having the righteousness of the law, but only with the righteousness which is by the faith of Jesus Christ.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.15*

3. Since the law of God has to do with the thoughts and intents of the heart, it is evident that no human law can enforce obedience to it, nor punish for disobedience thereof. A man may be as corrupt at heart as Satan can make him, and yet if he preserves a fair exterior, men may call him good. Therefore it follows that,*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.16*

4. When the State assumes the power of re-enacting and making effective the laws of God, it will declare men to be moral who are grossly corrupt. And since the natural tendency of men is to self-

satisfaction, the result will be to fasten men in chains of vice. It will be useless to preach the gospel to men whom a power which they are taught to believe has authority above God, has declared to be righteous. And so the so-called Christian nation will be a nation where murder, adultery, and theft will be clothed with the garb of Christianity. Thus the abettors of religious legislation take away the key of knowledge, not entering into the kingdom of God themselves, and hindering those who would.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.17*

To sum up: We oppose religious legislation by civil governments, because it is unjust, and inconsistent with that civil liberty which is inalienable and God-given. Especially is it un-American, directly subversive of that which the founders of this government fought and labored to establish and maintain. Still more do we oppose it, because it is antichristian, tending only to immorality and practical idolatry. It repudiates the power of Christ and the Holy Spirit; it treats the word of God as a common thing, subjecting it to the judgment of men and the caprices of politicians; it even denies God himself, by attributing to fallible mortals the authority which belongs to him alone.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.18*

It is, in fact, of the very essence of heathenism; for while a true theocracy is the best government that could be imagined,—God himself being ruler,—when men appoint themselves vicegerents of God, they do just what the heathen did. Therefore, we call on all true Americans—upon all lovers of the liberty bequeathed to us by our fathers in the immortal Declaration of Independence; and with a still louder call we appeal to all lovers of God, of the Bible as his inspired word, and of the pure gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, to unite with us in warning the people against this monster of injustice and mystery of iniquity—religious legislation.*AMS December 25, 1889, page 381.19*

E. J. W.



